THE

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Nº CXXVIII. *JULY* 1907.

ART. I.—THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM.

1. *Durham University.* 'College Histories' Series. By J. T. FOWLER, D.C.L., F.S.A. (London: F. E. Robinson & Co., 1904.)
2. *Report of the Commissioners appointed for the Purposes of the Durham University Act,* 1861. *Copy of all Evidence taken by the Durham University Commissioners under the Durham University Act,* 1861. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 27 February 1863. (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode.)
3. *Draft of an Act to make Further Provision with Respect to the University of Durham.*

CANON FOWLER commences his interesting history of the University of Durham with a chapter entitled 'Earlier Foundations.' He mentions the monastic college founded by Bishop Hatfield in the University of Oxford, which came to an end in 1540, and on the site of which Trinity College was founded in 1555. He describes the plan for founding a college in Durham in the reign of Henry VIII.—'a noble scheme, but it was not carried out.' And he summarizes the order issued by Cromwell and his Privy Council in 1657 for the founding of a college in Durham, to which an end was put by '"the blessed Restoration."

as Carlyle calls it in irony, and as some of us call it in deep thankfulness.' Canon Fowler then proceeds to 'The Present Foundation: its Constitution and its Developments.' The first recorded steps towards the foundation of the University were taken in the year 1831 by the Bishop and the Dean and Chapter of Durham; and Canon Fowler is doubtless right in ascribing their action to 'the great and increasing population of the Northern counties, together with their remoteness from the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge—the railway system being as yet in its infancy.' There is the less reason for looking for any other motive, because in the movement, in Cromwell's day, for a college in Durham 'stress was laid on the great distance of Oxford and Cambridge,' and on the desirability of raising the general standard of learning in the North. We may take it, in the words of the charter founding the University, that the said University of Durham was 'established under our Royal sanction, and the authority of our Parliament,' in the hope that it might 'under the blessing of Almighty God, prove an eminent source of good to our loving subjects, especially in the Northern parts of our realm of England.'

In fine, though Universities such as those of Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, Liverpool, and Sheffield are often supposed to be the first 'local' Universities which were created in England, as a matter of historical fact the first attempt to create a local University in England was made by the Bishop and the Dean and Chapter of Durham; and if the attempt was, as the early history of the University seems to shew, premature, the fact that the attempt was made is proof of the statesman-like foresight of the ecclesiastics who devised it. The circumstances which militated, at first, against the success of the scheme were not foreseen, and could hardly have been foreseen, by anyone at the time: the railway system was as yet in its infancy and no one could have foretold its effects upon the experiment of trying to create a local University. They are obvious enough now when we look at the number of undergraduates in residence in each of the years from 1841 to

1861. In 1841 the number was 72, and in the next seven years it grew steadily until it became 131; then from 131 in 1848 it dropped to 122 in 1850, to 110 in 1853, to 80 in 1857, to 58 in 1850, and to 41—the lowest point—in 1861. 'The constitution of the University,' as Canon Fowler says, 'was modelled on that of Christ Church, Oxford, of which one of its founders, Dr. Smith, had been head'; and Durham, as a local University, competed unsuccessfully with Oxford for undergraduates, who, whether they would or would not have turned to Durham in the absence of railway facilities, preferred to go to Oxford or Cambridge when the railways made it easy for them to do so. So unsuccessful had been this educational experiment that

'in the year 1861, a Return was laid before Parliament, which showed such a condition of the University that, without recourse to a preliminary Commission of Inquiry, an Act of Parliament was passed to provide for the better government and extension of the University.'

The appointment of the Commission of 1861 marks the termination of the first period of the history of the University of Durham; and, as the Commission was appointed to provide for the better government of the University,[1] we must look back to see what actually had been the government which had worked so badly during this period of the University's history.

In 1832 an Act of Parliament was passed which, among other things that it did, vested in the Dean and Chapter of Durham the government of the University, and the order and discipline to be observed therein, according to the regulations which the Dean and Chapter, with the consent of the Bishop, were empowered to make. On July 20, 1835, the Dean and Chapter, with the consent of the Bishop, made regulations 'for the better establishment of the University,' and ordained and prescribed that, under the Bishop as Visitor and the Dean and Chapter as

[1] *Report of the Commissioners appointed for the Purposes of the Durham University Act*, 1861, p. 1.

Governors, the affairs of the University should be managed by the Warden, and a Senate and a Convocation. In 1841 an Act of Parliament, based on a draft scheme approved in Chapter, November 20, 1841,[1] was passed which made it lawful for certain property, held partly by the Bishop and partly by the Dean and Chapter in trust for the University, to be transferred to the University by the authority of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. The Act also made it

'lawful, by the like Authority,[2] with the Consent of the said University and also of the said Bishop and of the said Dean and Chapter, to transfer to the said Warden, Masters and Scholars the Whole or any Part of the Powers relating to the Government of the said University, and the Order and Discipline to be observed therein which are now vested in the said Dean and Chapter.'

By an Order in Council, gazetted March 15, 1842, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners carried out the Act of 1841 so far as regards the transference of property. As regards the transference of the Powers of Government, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners 'humbly recommend and propose that nothing herein contained shall prevent us from recommending and proposing other measures relating to the University of Durham in conformity with the provisions of the said Act' of 1841. But, though they were and remained at liberty to transfer the Powers of Government from the Dean and Chapter to the Warden, Masters and Scholars, they did not transfer them; and 'the Powers relating to the Government of the said University, and the Order and Discipline to be observed therein' continued to be, and at the present day still are, 'vested in the said Dean and Chapter.'

Thus the University found itself in a strange position: its 'affairs' were to be 'managed' by itself, but the government of the University was to be in the hands of a Dean and Chapter. With responsibility thus divided, there was

[1] Fowler, *Durham University*, p. 24.

[2] 'The authority,' Canon Fowler says, 'of an Order in Council to be issued for the purpose, according to the provisions in Act 3 and 4 Vict., cap. 113, lxxxiii–lxxxv.'

no body on whom the duty clearly fell of taking steps to remedy the depletion of the University caused by the development of railways; and the Commission of 1861 was accordingly appointed by Parliament 'to provide for the better government of the University.'

With the Ordinances made for that purpose by the Commission it is unnecessary for us to deal. The Dean and Chapter and the University petitioned against them; and the Ordinances were disallowed. They were disallowed by the Privy Council partly because the Commissioners had proposed to create a School of Physical Science and to introduce the new degrees of Bachelor and Master of Theology—both of which proposals were held to exceed the powers conferred on the Commissioners of 1861—and partly because the Ordinances were held to be inconsistent with the Charter so far as respects the status of the Dean and Chapter of Durham, since the Commissioners had proposed 'to vest in the Senate the whole of the government of the University.' [1]

The Dean and Chapter, having thus successfully demonstrated that the powers of governing the University were in their hands and not in those of the University, had to accept the responsibility which goes with power. Accordingly, in 1865 they framed a Statute of Chapter 'for the improvement and extension of the University.' By that statute they did what the Commissioners had proposed to do but had been ruled to have no power to do: they founded a School of Physical Science; and they made at any rate one regulation about Degrees in Theology, though no degree was actually conferred until many years later. But, having made this statute, Chapter relapsed into the old state of inactivity: for over forty years—from 1865 to the present day—they have neither initiated nor attempted to initiate any change whatever for the improvement or extension of the University, and have confined themselves to resisting the attempts which have been made to transfer to the University the power of governing itself. To those attempts we will recur hereafter in their historical order.

[1] *Report of the Commissioners*, p. 13.

The cost, to the undergraduates, of education at Durham had been pronounced by the Commissioners of 1861 to be too great—'we think the charges excessive.' The Chapter accordingly, in their Statute of 1865, decreed that 'the Senate shall take measures forthwith to reduce the expense of students in the University.' The expense was reduced; and two consequences followed. First, the number of undergraduates went up. In 1861 the number was forty-one. By 1870 it had doubled. In 1881 it had doubled again. In 1891 it had increased to 219. In 1906 it increased still more. Next, the character of the University changed: it ceased to be a 'local' University. The undergraduates came from all parts of England; few came, or come now, to Durham from the North-Eastern district. If a chart shewing the number of undergraduates at Durham from year to year be compared with one shewing the fluctuations of British trade, it will be seen that the number of Durham undergraduates follows, and we may reasonably say depends, on the commercial prosperity of the country at large. But, while increasing numbers of undergraduates were coming from all parts of the country to Durham (with the object, in 90 per cent. at least of the cases, of taking Holy Orders), and while the University of Durham was thus coming to meet not a local but a national need, it began in 1871 to perform, in addition, the function of a local University. In that year a College of Physical Science was founded in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and became the School of Physical Science which the Chapter, following the proposal of the Commissioners, had resolved to create. This College of Physical Science was founded, according to the *Durham University Calendar*, 'by the joint co-operation of the University and the leading land proprietors, employers of skilled labour &c. in the North of England.' In 1874 the College was formally incorporated with the University; and 'in 1904 it was agreed that the College of Science should be called Armstrong College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, in the University of Durham.' The students of Armstrong College read for degrees in science and for the B.Litt. They come principally from Newcastle and the

neighbouring district; and though Engineering and Mining students come from other parts of the country and from foreign countries, the University through Armstrong College performs the work of a local University, while through its Colleges situated in the city of Durham it draws undergraduates from all parts of England and even of the Empire.

We have now to resume the history of the University's struggle to obtain the power of governing itself. The Ordinances of the Commissioners appointed for the purposes of the Durham University Act, 1861, were, as we have said, disallowed, on the petition of the Dean and Chapter and the University. It is noteworthy that in the petition of the University no objection whatever is raised to the transference of government from the Chapter to the University, though many other of the provisions are petitioned against. It is also noteworthy that the Dean—at that time Dr. Waddington—in writing to the Senate (December 23, 1862), said:

'Now the Commission is not empowered by the Act which constitutes it to deprive the Dean and Chapter of that office'—the office of Governors of the University—'and it will be proper to remonstrate against that proceeding. Still, I should advise the Dean and Chapter to cede that position. *To be under the direct control of an Ecclesiastical Body would certainly be injurious to the prospects of a young and liberal institution; and the duties of that office would be better performed by the Senate.*'

The Commissioners, at whose head was the then Bishop of Durham, recorded in their Final Report that '*we think it a matter of the first importance to vest in the Senate the whole of the government of the University.*'

The transference of the powers of government from the Chapter to the Senate, thus laid down alike by the Bishop and the Dean of Durham in 1862 as the objective of movements of reform, has remained so ever since. In 1895 seven members of the Senate—six clerical and one lay—drew up a memorandum giving their reasons for urging that the transference should be made. The memo-

randum was drawn up on the suggestion of Bishop Westcott, who, as Visitor of both Chapter and Senate, suggested a conference between the two bodies to consider whether the time had not now come for transferring the power of governing the University from the Chapter to the University itself. There was a strong feeling in the Senate that the relations of the Chapter to the University were in some ways detrimental to its highest efficiency; and, if Bishop Westcott came to the conclusion that it was desirable that the question should be thoroughly discussed at a conference, we may be sure that he came to that conclusion after careful consideration.

The memorandum above mentioned, from members of Senate resident in Durham, desired 'the application of the provisions of the Act of 1841 relating to the government of the University.' It points out that

'the Commission of 1862, and those who opposed its Ordinances, seem alike to have overlooked the existence of the clause [in the Act of 1841, making it lawful to transfer the powers of government from the Dean and Chapter to the University] although an abstract of it is printed in the appendix to the evidence taken by the Commissioners.'

It explains that the 'governing' function of the Chapter resides in the power of the Chapter to make statutes for the University; and it goes on to say:

'A Statute of Chapter is a document in which the University does not appear as a party. The Dean and Chapter (with the consent of the Visitor) "order, ordain, and prescribe," and the University is purely passive. We venture to describe this position, of being passively subject to the legislative action of a non-academic and external corporation, as an abnormal position for a University to occupy. And for a University, and especially a University with its position to win, and threatened with serious competition in winning it, to be abnormally constituted is a serious weakness, and places it in a position of disadvantageous inequality as compared with other Universities. We would add that when this supreme governing corporation is one small in numerical composition, and representative of a single interest, the weakness resulting to the University becomes more serious still.'

The memorandum concludes with the words:

'We trust, my Lord, that nothing we have said can be misconstrued as implying the slightest complaint, either as regards the Chapter as a Body, or as regards individuals. The number of men of high character and distinction who have since the foundation of the University been members of the Chapter is enough to convince anyone that the experiment of Chapter Government has been tried under the most favourable personal conditions. Our objection is solely to the system, or rather to its too long continuance. Necessary as a prop to the infant University, with its growth the Chapter government becomes unnecessary; with its further progress, it must become a hindrance; in its future development, a danger. We therefore venture to ask, my Lord, for your consent to a scheme under the Act of 1841, and we confidently appeal to the magnanimity and public spirit of the great historic Chapter of Durham to allow us to rank the present Chapter in our grateful recognition as our benefactors, side by side with our founders, the Chapter of 1832.'

The canons declined to attend the conference to which Bishop Westcott had invited them. The memorandum which they forwarded to the Bishop is not given in Dr. Fowler's book, nor has it, so far as we can discover, been published elsewhere. But we may safely surmise that it was read by Bishop Westcott with great disappointment and regret.

The refusal of the Chapter made the conference impossible. It also made, as was pointed out by Bishop Westcott at the time, an appeal to Parliament inevitable. In 1896 it was open to Chapter to transfer to the University either the whole of the powers relating to the government of the University or such part of them as they might have agreed with the University to transfer under the Act of 1841. The refusal of the Chapter to confer with the University on the matter rendered it impossible to set going the permissive machinery of the Act of 1841; and made it inevitable, therefore, that the power of Parliament should be invoked. The refusal of the Chapter, in 1896, to accept the invitation of Bishop Westcott to confer with him and

with the University, has resulted in the Bill which is laid before Parliament in 1907.

In the Memorandum from members of Senate resident in Durham which was presented to the Bishop in 1895, it is pointed out that

> if it be objected that the proposed application of the Act of 1841 would remove a possibly desirable check on the unrestrained legislative action of this University, we think, frankly, that the necessity of such a check is sufficiently provided for by the Power of Consent reserved to the Visitor,'

but, if further check be required—and in the opinion of the signatories it is not—a University Court might be provided for. Here we are at once brought face to face with the peculiar nature of the University of Durham. On the one hand, as regards Newcastle, it is a local University, supplying the needs of the North-Eastern district of England; on the other hand, as regards Durham, it draws from all parts of England undergraduates who desire to take Holy Orders. So far, therefore, as it is a local University, it might be desirable for it to do as other local Universities do, and place itself under a University Court composed of local magnates and appealing to local patriotism. But, in so doing, it would forfeit its national character; and the Durham Colleges, which have been educating an ever-increasing number of candidates for the priesthood, and which do not depend upon local influences for their supply of students, would be emptied if the University were transformed into a local University, governed by a University Court consisting, say, of the leading land proprietors, employers of skilled labour, and representatives of County and other Councils.

This difficulty is turned, by the 'Bill to make further provision with respect to the University of Durham,' in a very simple way: by the first clause of the schedule, 'the Bishop of Durham shall be the Visitor of the University'; by the third clause, 'the office and powers of the Dean and Chapter of Durham as Governors of the University shall cease as soon as this scheme comes into operation'; by the

fourth and fifth clauses the power of making regulations for the University is given to the Senate; while the twelfth clause provides that, when appeal is made to Convocation, 'Convocation may veto any resolution of Senate affecting the regulations of the University.' No University Court is created. The University becomes completely autonomous.

If, however, the Dean and Chapter, by the Bill, were deprived of their office and power as Governors, and were simply excluded entirely from the University which was founded by them, the Bill would not meet with the approval of any fair-minded man. Still less could we approve of it if the connexion of the Durham Colleges with the Cathedral Church of Durham were broken by the Bill; or if the property which supports them, and which originally was (in the words of the Act of Parliament of 1832), 'a specific Portion of the Property of the said Cathedral Church,' were diverted from the original purpose of its endowment. But Schedule VI. 5 to the Bill expressly provides that 'always due regard shall be had to the original purpose of the endowment and to its connection with the Cathedral Church of Durham.' Further, the Dean and Chapter, who at the present moment have no control whatever over the endowment—having parted with it in the manner described above on page 260—are to be made, by Schedule VI. of the Bill, members of the body politic and corporate which is to have complete and absolute control over the endowment. This body politic and corporate—which under the name of the Council of the Durham Colleges is to have perpetual succession and a common seal—is to consist of the Dean and Chapter, Heads of Houses, and some other fourteen or more persons; and is to be 'the governing body of the Durham division of the University.' Further, by Schedule VI. 8 'the two canonries of Durham hitherto annexed to Professorships of Divinity and of Greek in the University of Durham shall remain so annexed. Appointments to these Professorships shall be made, as now, by the Lord Bishop of Durham.'

It is indeed with the Senate of the University and not with the Council of the Durham Colleges that the power is

to reside (Sched. V. 4) of determining the conditions on which candidates may be admitted to degrees. But that power is limited materially—and advantageously—by Sched. V. 11, which provides that 'no regulation affecting the Faculty of Theology shall as far as the said Faculty is affected thereby be made, amended or abrogated except with the consent of the Council of the Durham Colleges'; and by Sched. V. 17, which forbids the Senate to make any alteration in the regulations affecting students of the Durham division in the matter of residence or study 'without the consent of the Council of the Durham Colleges.'

With the Dean and Chapter members of a Council possessing these powers; with two canons occupying *ex officio* the chairs of Divinity and Greek; with the provision that due regard shall always be had to the original purposes of the endowment and to its connexion with the Cathedral Church of Durham; and with the Lord Bishop of Durham as the Visitor of the University to whom appeal can always be made against any measure that may even appear to be wanting in due regard to the original purpose of the endowment, there seems to be little ground for undue apprehension lest the connexion of the Durham Colleges with the Cathedral Church should be broken, or lest the property which supports them should be diverted from the original purpose of the endowment.

As regards the proposed re-constitution of the Senate, we notice that, as at present the Dean of Durham and the two canons who are *ex officio* Professors of Divinity and Greek are members of Senate in virtue of their offices, so they will continue, of right, to be members of the new Senate. The Senate, as re-constituted, is to consist of the Chancellor of the University and thirty-six other members. The first Chancellor is to be the Very Reverend G. W. Kitchin, Dean of Durham. Twelve members, we may say, are to come from Durham, twelve from the Newcastle Colleges, six are to be appointed by the Crown, and six by the Convocation of the University. Whenever a University is reformed, members of Convocation are naturally and rightly concerned to see that their position is not infringed;

it is therefore proper to inquire how Durham graduates are affected by the re-constitution of the Senate. In the Senate as it exists at present there are seventeen members, of whom two are elected by members of Convocation. In the Senate, as re-constituted by the Bill, there are thirty-seven members, of whom six are to be elected by members of Convocation. Thus whereas at present Durham graduates appoint only one ninth of the members of the Senate, in the proposed Senate they will elect one sixth. It appears, then, that both absolutely and relatively members of Convocation gain in power by the change. At present they elect two members of a Senate which does not possess the powers of government; in future they will, by the Bill, elect six members of a Senate which will possess these powers.

As many Theological Colleges are affiliated to the University, it may be well to notice that, by Schedule V. 13, 'without the consent of the Visitor (the Bishop of Durham) Senate shall not abrogate the affiliation of any College now affiliated to the University.'

In this connexion we note that the Bill contemplates the possibility and the probability that the University may desire to affiliate other colleges. As a local University, Durham owes a duty to towns in the North of England which are endeavouring to provide higher education for their children. In many of those towns there are colleges which are on the way to reach the level of University Colleges; and the University of Durham must, if it is to do its duty, be prepared to admit those colleges. The power to admit them it already possesses; and the Bill proposes to ensure that the power shall be properly exercised, and that it shall not be possible for the University, on inadequate grounds, or from mistaken jealousy, to exclude colleges which are fit to be admitted. The Bill therefore provides that the conditions of admission shall not be left to be determined by the University—for the University, or its colleges, might be suspected of intentional or unintentional unfairness—but by the appointed Commissioners. The Commissioners are to make statutes regulating the conditions under which colleges other than those at present

connected with the University may become affiliated to it and regulating the procedure of affiliation. The Commissioners are to provide, in particular, for the representation of any colleges thus admitted in future; and they are to provide for an appeal to the Privy Council on the part of any college within the counties of Northumberland, Durham, Cumberland and Westmorland, to which affiliation may have been refused without reasonable and sufficient cause. On the whole, therefore, placing ourselves at the point of view of Technical and other Colleges which desire that they may become part of the University of Durham when they are, in the opinion of disinterested judges, fit to be admitted, we feel that the approach has been made both broad and smooth for them.

To turn from the effects which the Bill may have upon colleges not yet part of the University to the effects which it may have upon the Colleges at present comprised within it: it is of course not improbable that one of the consequences which will follow, if the Bill becomes law, will be that students of the University in Newcastle will be admitted to the B.A. without being required to know any Greek. If so, Bishops will need to ascertain whether a man holding the Durham B.A. has studied Greek, and whether he has 'resided' in the University in the sense in which 'residence' is understood both in the older Universities and in Durham, though not in Newcastle. To enable Bishops to ascertain this unmistakeably it is provided by Schedule X. 3 that 'the privilege of appending the words "*in litteris antiquis*" to the title of their degrees shall be open only to those graduates in arts who have pursued in the Durham division of the University a curriculum which has included both Latin and Greek.' A simple inspection, therefore, of the parchment testifying that a man is a B.A. of the University of Durham will shew whether the B.A. is a B.A. *in litteris antiquis*, and therefore whether the man has resided in Durham and taken Latin and Greek for his degree.

It remains finally to examine these proposed changes from the point of view of the interests of the University

and of the Church of England; for that the Church of England has rightly a voice in the constitution of Durham University cannot be doubted. The University was definitely founded with money belonging to the Church of England, and for the sake of training clergy for the Church. To interfere with this purpose would be most improper; but though the Church has rightly this interest in the University—an interest which the Bill endeavours to safeguard in every way—that is no excuse for an attempt on the part of the Church to interfere with the self-government of the University.

We had better begin with the essential point—the abolition of the existing powers of the Dean and Chapter of Durham. We do not think that there can be any real doubt that this is most desirable. All experience in the past has shewn that this submission of a University to ecclesiastical authority is almost invariably disastrous. The Dean and Chapter may be an excellent body for governing a Cathedral, but they are not in their corporate capacity in any way fitted for governing a University. Nor is the continuance of their authority in any way desirable for the Church: it will produce nothing but resentment. It is as improper for the University to be subjected to ecclesiastical authority as it would for the Church to be governed by a municipality or by the State. Each has its own function to perform and ought to be left to do it independently. In the interests, therefore, both of the University and of the Church we heartily welcome this proposed change. But we have a further right to ask whether the attitude of the University as re-constituted will be favourable to the conditions on which the University was founded. It is well known that in recent years as a reaction from the old conditions in which the Universities were hampered by religious tests or subservience to ecclesiastical authority newer Universities and University Colleges have grown up with strong anti-clerical tests. They are debarred from giving theological degrees or making theological appointments. This is an entirely wrong position. A University, being a free and self-governing body, ought to be left free

to manage its own religious affairs without being hampered by Acts of Parliament or Trust deeds. From this point of view there has been a gradual improvement of recent years. Thus, the University of London, for example, in its newly constituted form has lost a great deal of its old religious narrowness, and the Victoria University at Manchester has formed a Theological Faculty. What we should aim at is religious freedom. From this point of view the new Bill marks a distinct advance. In § V. 2 of the Schedule it is stated that 'except in the Faculty of Theology the Senate shall not require or impose any religious test unless in its capacity of trustee of a benefaction to which such a condition had been attached by its foundation.' We are gradually approaching religious liberty. The University of Durham is not going to be so foolish as the University College at Bangor, which had to give up a bequest of quite a proper character because very broad religious restrictions were attached to its receipt. Durham will be free also to develop for any religious body both religious teaching and religious worship in connexion with the Faculty of Theology. This clause therefore, so far as we can see, guarantees very complete religious liberty. As regards the Durham Colleges, they are to be carried on in accordance with the intentions with which they were founded, and that, again, ought to leave them perfect freedom for fulfilling their religious functions. We thus think that in the main points of the re-constitution of the University the arrangements are satisfactory.

On one point, we venture to think, a change might have been made. For many years past a sum of 1,260*l.* a year has been paid out of the funds of the Durham Colleges towards the Armstrong College at Newcastle-upon-Tyne. When this payment was first made there were no Treasury subsidies for University Colleges; and it would be a reasonable proposal, we cannot but think, that now that the Newcastle College is in receipt of large grants, and has received adequate endowments of its own, this sum should be returned to the Durham Colleges. It is quite true, as the promoters of the Bill state, that nothing is given away by this Act: that the

grant was made many years ago; but circumstances have changed since then, and we believe that it would do away with a good deal of friction if the Durham Colleges were allowed to retain their own property.

The next question which will be asked is, Does the proposed constitution guarantee to the University proper independence and autonomy? We venture to think it does, and so far as regards the constitution of the University it seems to us quite satisfactory. The Bishop of Durham, quite rightly remembering the old traditions of the Palatinate and the origin of the University, retains his position as Visitor, with certain powers of veto. There are opportunities for an appeal to Convocation, Convocation being rightly a conservative body which fences the traditions of the University. The Senate contains a proper proportion of representatives of teachers, of administrators and of graduates. Altogether the constitution seems to us well thought out. We are not quite certain whether we can say the same, however, about the constitution of the Council of the Durham Colleges. It is quite right that the Dean and Chapter should be members of it, but we are bound to say that we consider the representation of teachers upon it to be most inadequate, and we should certainly like to see the number of those thus elected increased from three to six. Unless the actual teachers are adequately represented upon the governing bodies of Universities and Colleges there is a very serious danger that the interests of educational progress and learning may be neglected. The Universities are carried on in the interests of administration and not in the interests of teaching. To any thoughtful person at the present day the elaborate arrangements for organizing education, the large sums of money spent upon officials and administrators, and the time devoted to these external paraphernalia must create great misgivings. It is much more important to pay a person properly and set him down to teach than it is to make elaborate rules and restrictions which have often very little relation to the actual work of the teacher. We should hope, therefore, that the teaching staff will be

more largely represented on the governing body of the Colleges, and we trust that the Council which has by Sched. VI. 1. the power of co-opting three persons will have the wisdom regularly to co-opt three members of the teaching staff.

There remains a third point to discuss. How far is it possible out of two heterogeneous bodies situated in two cities nearly twenty miles apart to create one homogeneous University? The essence of a University is intellectual life. Will there be this in Durham in the future? So far as regards the two separate portions the arrangements proposed mark a distinct step in advance. The present Durham Colleges and any new ones that are founded will be grouped together with identity of interests and identity of life. It is suggested further that a union should take place on the other side of the Armstrong College and the Medical School at Newcastle. This again is most desirable. But how will it be possible to harmonize Durham and Newcastle? Can unity be created out of them, or will they be two unequally yoked horses pulling different ways, and only kept together by an elaborately balanced Senate? We believe that on the whole it will be possible to obtain a considerable amount of unity. For all practical purposes Durham and Newcastle are no further apart than one side of London is from another. It will be easy for students in one College to attend the best lectures at the other. We venture to think that special arrangements might be made with the railway company by which members of the University could travel backward and forward at very much reduced fares. It is not so difficult, for example, to pass from the University of Durham to the Armstrong College at Newcastle as it is from the East London College to the place at present used for the University of London. We hope, therefore, that there may grow up in Durham and Newcastle a strong centre of intellectual life, and that when, as is proposed, the various restrictions have been removed which would necessarily cause irritation to the Newcastle Colleges and they are free to give their own instruction in Arts as well as in Science

and Technology, a healthy rivalry will take the place of any sort of suspicion. We certainly believe that both Colleges have a future before them. Durham has traditions of ecclesiastical and archæological knowledge which might be developed in the future. Newcastle is the great Northern centre of industry, and ought to be a home of instruction in pure and applied science. We believe that it would be wise if the Northern educational authorities were to make Durham the great centre for the training of their teachers, who might there obtain a University degree and University life. The advantages to education would be very great. The University is, we believe, most hospitable to members of other religious bodies, and we feel that a great school of theological training might be built up under the shadow of St. Cuthbert's shrine on the banks of the Wear.

Two things we would plead. The first is that the newly constituted Durham University should make its Matriculation standard approximate to that of other Universities. We are glad to think that an advance towards this has been made in the examination for matriculation in the Faculties of Medicine, Science, Letters and Music. The University should become the centre of educational life for the four Northern counties, and it should help to set a standard for all the Secondary schools within its area by having an adequate matriculation or school-leaving examination. There is no need that this should slavishly copy other models. It may very reasonably exact a lower standard in mathematics than so many Universities aim at, but it must compensate for this by excellence in other subjects. The result of recent conferences has, we hope, made it clear that there is no need for uniformity. What we desire is that all Universities should maintain an adequate standard and should not lower the value of the degree by lowering unduly the severity of the entrance examination. We should like the Durham University degree to be one which could be accepted by any other University. Nothing, however, in this need interfere with the privileges of entrance granted to those who have studied for two years at the Theological Colleges. That privilege is probably

a very wise one. It encourages the future study of those who have been inadequately educated earlier, and two years of the study of theology may quite reasonably be considered to exempt from an entrance examination. No one would join a Theological College in order to obtain a degree on easy terms.

The other point which we would like to emphasize is that we cannot help thinking that both Durham and Newcastle might make greater efforts to raise their standard of real learning. Durham has done useful work. It has educated many people who could not have been educated otherwise; but somehow or other it has always failed to attain its right ideal. It has not produced so many distinguished theologians as it should have done: it has not created a great school of theology for the Church of England. It might also, we think, have created a school of archæology, of antiquities and of English history. It has had the men who might have done this, and has hardly known how to use them. There have been distinguished archæologists in Durham who would have adorned a Chair in any University. But there has been a want of really serious interest in the advancement of learning, and we cannot help feeling that this has been partly due to the deadening influence of the Dean and Chapter. The same is true of Newcastle. We do not associate the Newcastle College with any great scientific eminence. Its Medical school is a good one, its technical work is good, but it has not produced, so far as we are aware, or helped to develop, as distinguished men as some of the other newer Universities have done. We hope that under their new constitution both the Colleges will develop a loftier intellectual ambition.

Art. II. ST. DAVID AND THE EARLY WELSH SAINTS.

1. *An Essay on the Welsh Saints.* By the Rev. Rice Rees, M.A. (London, 1836.)
2. *Lives of the Cambro-British Saints.* By the Rev. W. J. Rees, M.A., F.S.A. (Llandovery: The Welsh MSS. Society, 1853.)
3. *A Dissertation on the Pelagian Heresy.* By the Rev. John Williams, M.A. (Carmarthen, 1808.)
4. *History and Antiquities of St. David's.* By Dr. Basil Jones, Bishop of St. David's, and Professor E. A. Freeman. (London, 1856.)
5. *A Tour in Wales.* By Thomas Pennant. (London, 1778.)
6. *Diocesan History of Llandaff.* By the Rev. E. J. Newell, M.A. (London: S.P.C.K., 1902.)
7. *The Celtic Church of Wales.* By J. Willis Bund. (London: D. Nutt, 1897.)
8. *Wales.* 'Story of the Nations' Series. By O. M. Edwards. (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1901.)

And many other works.

The age of complete independence enjoyed by the early Cambro-British Church may be described as beginning with the withdrawal of the Roman legions from Britain in the first years of the fifth century, and continuing until the general spread of Christianity among the Anglo-Saxons in the seventh. During this lapse of time, which covers, roughly speaking, about 200 years, the golden period of the Welsh Church may be definitely fixed as extending from the close of the fifth century to the landing of St. Augustine, and it was during this intervening space of 100 years that the principal Cymric saints flourished. Before, however, endeavouring to give a short account of St. David and his fellow saints out of the vast mass of information, both legendary and historical, at a student's command, it is absolutely necessary that we should sketch a contem-

porary picture, however slight and incomplete, of Wales and the Welsh Church, to form, as it were, a background to our subsequent sketches of St. David and the saints of the sixth century.

Although cut off from all intercourse on its eastern or landward side owing to the hostile presence of the pagan Anglo-Saxon settlers, Wales was able, nevertheless, to keep up a constant inter-communication by sea with her Celtic sister-nations of Ireland, Cornwall, Scotland, Strathclyde, and Brittany. For this reason, then, we find that many of the so-called Welsh saints were recruited from Irish, Scotch, or Breton stock; indeed, so plentiful was the supply of missionaries from Brittany alone, that this distant Celtic country was compared by the chronicler Gildas to 'a winter bee-hive that in the pleasant spring-time sends out its principal swarm to gather honey elsewhere.' The Cambro-British Church was therefore compounded partly of old Roman civilization—which was still represented by a certain number of secular priests in the chief centres of population—and partly of a new form of Christianity which was peculiar to Celtic soil; and these two elements, blending together, were able by the close of the sixth century to produce a national Church in Wales which, in spite of all the religious and political changes of 1,300 years, still possesses not a few traces of its double Romano-Celtic origin.

Dismissing at once the tales of chivalry which later generations of writers have ascribed to this dim and distant period, we may state with confidence that the general life of Wales was rude and illiterate, and that such learning, piety, and refinement as still survived in Britannia Secunda were limited exclusively to the great monastic establishments which form the chief feature of early Celtic religious life, and which may in some respects be compared to the large Buddhist communities that are still in existence to-day in Burma.

'The primary local unit in Celtic Christendom was the monastery, not the diocese. The monastery was the centre of missionary enterprise. The titles of bishop and abbot seem to have been somewhat loosely used; and if the records can be trusted, there seem to

have been a large number of bishops who were the heads, not of dioceses, but of monastic establishments.'[1]

These houses, partaking equally of the nature of seminary and abbey, served as oases of godliness and culture in a surrounding wilderness of ignorance and brute force. Into these communities, therefore, all persons who desired to lead holy, peaceful or studious lives were thankful to retire, when they had grown to shun or hate their half-pagan and wholly savage surroundings in the outer world. But the inmates of these religious houses were not content to let the years pass by in self-righteous and selfish ease; on the contrary, the various monasteries vied with each other in training and sending out preachers to humanize the rude Cambrian population, which, if the generally accepted accounts be credible, seems to have been Christian merely in name. The method employed was the founding in central situations of small cells—these were in the first instance no more than wooden huts thatched with ferns or rushes—which might serve at once as rallying points to collect a local congregation, and as temporary hermitages for the missionary monks themselves. In course of time some at least of these humble booths would give place to more substantial buildings, to expand later into parish churches with a definite area of influence attached. In all cases the cell or church so established was called by its founder's own name, so that even to this day there exist in all parts of Wales hundreds of such examples, which give to our own generation an undoubted and unbroken link with the remote past.[2] Parishes so developed are easily distinguishable as a rule by the prefix *llan*, a term which includes not only the sacred building itself (the direct descendant of the original founder's hut), but also its adjoining graveyard, and possibly even its glebe-lands, the Welsh word being in fact the exact equivalent of the Greek τέμενος, or sacred enclosure. Each place bearing the prefix *llan*, therefore, with a saint's name annexed to it—as in Llandeilo, Llandudno, Llanbadarn, and

[1] Henry Owen, *Gerald the Welshman* (1901).

[2] Rice Rees, Preface to *An Essay on the Welsh Saints.*

the like—will at once disclose the fact of an actual foundation by the saint in person whose name it retains; so that in Wales we must be careful to draw a broad line of distinction between these ancient parochial institutions of the early Cambro-British Church, and the various churches, chapels or colleges of post-Norman date, which are dedicated to saints of the Roman calendar.

Among the principal monasteries by whose agency the still-existing parochial system of the principality was thus gradually evolved in the sixth and seventh centuries, we have only space here to allude to the great houses in South Wales founded by the royal saint, Catoc, 'who during the festival of Easter daily fed 100 priests, 100 soldiers, 100 workmen, and 100 beggars, with the same number of widows'; to the famous seminary of St. Illtyd at Llantwit in South Glamorgan; to the monastic establishments of Dubricius (Dyfrig) near the capital city of Caerleon-on-Usk; and of St. David at Menevia, of which last we intend to speak more fully. In North Wales by far the largest and most influential of these peculiarly Celtic institutions was that of Bangor-Iscoed (the high choir in the wood), on the banks of the Dee—founded by Dinooth, and utterly destroyed by the Saxons under Ethelfrith early in the seventh century—where, according to the Venerable Bede, 'such was the number of monks that, when they were divided into seven classes under their respective superintendents, none of these classes contained less than three hundred persons, all of whom supported themselves by their own labour.'[1]

Concerning the universal tendency of the pious and peaceful among all classes of Welsh society to retire into these monasteries, or to found and inhabit outlying cells, one most curious and perhaps unique fact may be noticed: of all those who sought the cloister or the wilderness in order to escape from the outer world of vice and bloodshed, only the names of such as were well-born (and therefore able to contribute more or less liberally to the endowment of the parish then in process of formation) have been handed down to us. In searching through the long roll of 479

[1] Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. cap. 2.

Welsh saints whose names and memory are for ever preserved in the parish churches of their own foundation, the student of Cambro-British ecclesiastical history will observe that all these saints are described as being of noble birth, an attribute which is especially noteworthy in a land where historic genealogy has always been highly prized. Nor is the possession of high descent the only feature to be remarked, for on a closer examination of the pedigrees given it will be observed that all, or nearly all, the saints mentioned are so closely inter-related that it would be not unnatural to describe this saintly aristocracy as a clique of three prominent Welsh families, which comprise in themselves the vast majority of the surviving names. These three saint-producing clans are the families descended from Cunedda Wledig (the Illustrious), a prince of pure Cymric descent; of Caw, a Pictish chieftain; and of Brychan, a royal Irish emigrant to Wales. So large a proportion of the total number of acknowledged Welsh saints belongs to these three groups of the 'children' of Cunedda, Caw, and Brychan, that we may reasonably conclude that every member of these three families who founded a cell or entered a monastic house owned an inherent right to saintship. This aspect of the rise and growth of the Cymric Church has been, and still is, the subject of so much controversy among historians and archæologists that, without venturing a private opinion in the matter, we will confine ourselves to quoting Mr. Newell's concise and admirable summing-up of the most probable theory concerning the character and rank borne by the early Welsh saints.

'What, then, are we to say of the four hundred and seventy-nine Welsh saints? Were they all saintly? The answer is to be found in the meaning of the word saint as used in Wales; it practically means 'monk'; the saints were those who left the world, the 'converted' folk who sought the protection of the monasteries. Those who are included in the roll of saints were the monks of noble or gentle birth. This is the secret of the saintly families; the tribal system was the foundation of Welsh life, and it affected ecclesiastical affairs as well as civil. Undoubtedly many men of meaner birth had as good claim to be enrolled in the list on the

score of saintliness as many whose names have been entered, but they lacked the requisite of noble birth. Some men are on the list who lived most of their life as worldlings or ruffians, and compensated by a late retirement to some monastery or to a hermitage for the vices of an ill-spent life. . . . But although of the four hundred and seventy-nine saints a large proportion were merely ordinary monks of good birth, there were unquestionably others who in any age would have taken a foremost place for saintliness of life, leaders in the great monastic movement, ascetics who lived lives of rigid austerity and self-discipline, students and scholars, the teachers and illuminators of their native land. These were saints in the strictest sense of the term, these were the men who combated the prevailing wickedness, and conquered by virtue of their faith, not indeed in the way in which the legends pictorially represent them, but no less completely and triumphantly.'[1]

With this brief and necessarily imperfect introduction we will now give such few individual accounts of the Welsh saints themselves as our space will allow. Many illustrious names are of necessity excluded, for we must content ourselves with sketches of St. David and of St. Winifred, who share the honour of being the only two Cymric saints whose names are familiar to English-speaking people; of St. Illtyd, tutor to David; and of Teilo, Deiniol, Asaph and Padarn, the traditional founders of the sees of Llandaff, Bangor, St. Asaph and Llanbadarn. We will first speak of St. Illtyd, as being somewhat earlier in date than his pupil David.

Illtyd Farchog (Iltutus the Knight) was a Breton nobleman, born about the middle of the fifth century, who spent much of his life in the service of the British Court at Caerleon. Finally quitting a life of arms, he retired to found a college at a spot near the Glamorganshire coast, called in his memory Llanilltyd Fawr, better known later Llantwit Major, where he became in course of time—to quote Gildas—'the refined teacher of almost all Britain.' Here at Llantwit (which still possesses some relics of its former sanctity and importance in its ancient crosses and its mediæval buildings) studied David, Paul of Léon, Samson

[1] E. J. Newell, *Diocesan History of Llandaff.*

of Dôl, and other holy men, and it was here that Gildas wrote the greater part of his Chronicles. Throughout the saint's lifetime the great house flourished and sent forth missionaries into the wildest parts of South Wales, where Illtyd himself founded many churches, of which thirteen still recall his name.

Illtyd is, however, not only honoured as the tutor of St. David and as the founder of various churches, but in the later Welsh poems, known as the *Triads*, the Abbot of Llantwit is extolled as the inventor of the ploughshare for the benefit both of his own countrymen and of the Irish people. The date of the saint's death is unknown, though his burial-place is traditionally placed near Capel Illtyd in Brecknockshire, at a spot whose local name of Bedd Gwyl Illtyd (the grave of St. Illtyd's Eve), serves to recall the pre-Reformation custom of keeping here the vigil of the saint's festival, which falls on February 7. Of the many legends that centre around this once popular saint, the most interesting bears a striking resemblance to the well-known incident in St. Giles' career, which has been so frequently treated both in mediæval and modern art. While Illtyd was spending some days in solitary prayer at one of his most remote hermitages, it came to pass that a pagan chieftain named Meirchion, whilst out hunting, pursued a hind which fled for safety to the holy man's cell. Here Illtyd, like a Celtic St. Francis of Assisi, at once extended his protection to 'his distressed sister, the hind,' keeping by his saintly powers both dogs and hunters from entering the cell in pursuit of their quarry. At first Meirchion was enraged at this unexpected spoiling of his day's sport, but at last, recognizing the sanctity of the hermit and the will of Heaven in this strange affair, the prince kneeled down before the man of God, and was speedily converted to Christianity. As in St. Giles' beautiful legend, Illtyd's rescued deer is said to have remained with its protector, and even to have drawn the saint's firewood on a little sledge in winter; in fact, the two stories are practically identical, except that in the French version the hind is made to arrive at the saint's cell wounded by an arrow, thereafter the special emblem of St. Giles.

The earliest biography we possess of St. David is that of Rhyddmarch, last but one of the British bishops of Menevia, who towards the close of the eleventh century first collected and inscribed the various accounts of the saint's life and miracles which were current in his time. Rhyddmarch's compilation served as the groundwork for the elaborate biographies of the saint written by Giraldus Cambrensis [1] and John of Tynemouth, but, as both these later writings abound in the grossest conceits of their times, it is from Bishop Rhyddmarch's earlier and less extravagant description alone that we can glean any authentic or probable information concerning the patron saint of Wales.

David or Dewi—for the common form of the name was not adopted by the Welsh until comparatively modern times—was born in the wild marshy dingle near Menevia, known as 'the Vale of Roses,' [1] although a very ancient legend fixes the saint's birthplace at a spot some sixty miles north on the Cardiganshire coast known as Hên Fynyw (Old Menevia), where an abundant spring of pure water called David's Well (Pistyll Dewi) is still pointed out by the inhabitants as the scene of his baptism. The saint was the son of Sandde ap Ceredig ap Cunedda, Prince of Ceredigion (the modern Cardiganshire), and of Non, daughter of Gynyr, a high-born maiden whom Sandde met by chance while out hunting and then seduced. The saint was therefore not begotten in wedlock, and though illicit intercourse before marriage has never been judged very severely in Cymric ethics, yet the scandal attaching to David's origin has invariably led his biographers to dwell more upon the magnificence of his lineage than upon the equivocal story of his birth. Of Non, the mother of Dewi, who is said to have subsequently married Prince Sandde, nothing further is recorded, although the fact that she founded four chapels in South Wales all bearing her name, and is ranked as a

[1] See 'Life and Times of Giraldus Cambrensis, Churchman and Historian' (*C. Q. R.*, Jan. 1903).

[2] *Vallis Rosina* is in reality derived from the Welsh *rhos*, a moor, and not from *rosyn*, a rose. Giraldus, with his love of punning, calls the valley 'rosina non rosea,' the Roseless Vale of Roses.

saint, leads us to believe that she must have left considerable wealth to the Church.[1] The date of David's birth may be placed with a considerable degree of probability as occurring about the year 500 A.D., and as every tradition assigns a life of unusual length to the saint, we may assume that his death took place some few years before the close of the sixth century, with which St. David's whole career may, broadly speaking, be regarded as contemporaneous.[2] As boy and youth, the saint frequented the colleges of Illtyd at Llantwit and of Paulinus (Paul de Léon) at Whitland,[3] where he soon grew famous for his piety, his learning and his asceticism, but especially for his marvellous powers of preaching.

During the early period of his career, the holy and venerable Dubricius, arch-abbot and bishop of Caerleon, and with him the whole British Church in Wales, were much harassed by the alarming spread of the Pelagian heresy, which (seeing that its author had been the Welsh monk Morgan, or Pelagius, of Bangor) not unnaturally adapted itself with success to the old bardic systems of belief that still lingered in Britain. At an important and largely attended conference (the date of which has been fixed with some degree of accuracy as the year 519 A.D.), held at Brefi on the river Teifi, between the orthodox and the Pelagian clergy, the controversy waxed hot between the spokesmen of either party. But at length Dubricius, who on this occasion was supported by the two missionary bishops from Gaul, Germanus of Auxerre[4] and Lupus of Troyes, finding himself worsted in argument owing to the superior wit and learning of the Pelagian priests, appealed to the many native clergy around him for a champion to refute the adversaries whom he himself

[1] Non's festival is observed on March 3. The churches of Llannon in Carmarthenshire and Llannon in Cardiganshire preserve her name.

[2] The popular myth which credits St. David with a life of 147 years divided into three mystic periods of seven times seven, is, of course, ridiculous.

[3] In Welsh, Ty-Gwyn ar Daf, and in Latin, Alba Domus. This spot, which lies about twenty miles west of Carmarthen, was in later times the site of a Cistercian abbey, founded by Bishop Bernard in 1143.

[4] Six churches in Wales, founded by this Gallic saint, bear his name in Llanarmon, St. Harmon's, Capel Garmon, &c.

use it. It is absurd to couple St. Germanus of Auxerre and St. Lupus of Troyes with Dubritius at the Synod of Llandewi Brefi in 519. They were both dead more than fifty years before

had failed to convince. Only after much persuasion was the youthful and modest Dewi a last induced by his elders to arise and address the whole assembly, although the effect produced by his eloquent reasoning was immediate.

'When all the fathers assembled enjoined David to preach, he commanded a child which attended him . . . to spread a napkin under his feet, and standing upon it, he began to expound the Gospel and the law to the auditory; all the while that this oration continued, a snow-white dove descending from heaven sate upon his shoulders; and, moreover, the earth on which he stood raised itself under him till it became a hill, from whence his voice like a trumpet was clearly heard, and understood by all, both near and far off.' [1]

From that memorable day the place of this synod became famous as Llandewi-Brefi (David's church at Brefi), and in later times the spot, thus sanctified by the wisdom and eloquence of the patron saint, was occupied by Bishop Bec's wealthy chauntry, which perished at the Reformation. The mysterious adjuncts to David's discourse mentioned above—the rising of the ground, the appearance of a dove, the sound of a trumpet—are obviously tributes to the saint's extraordinary powers of preaching on this occasion, such as may be traced in many a so-called 'legend' of the saints, as, for instance, in the beautiful story of the Tuscan girl-saint, Fina of San Gimignano, where her chronicler's description of the miraculous tolling of all the church bells in her native city can easily be recognized as a fantastic but poetical allusion to the immediate and universal grief felt by all classes of the citizens at the loss of their beloved St. Fina.

Upon this successful display of youthful inspiration, the delighted and awe-struck Dubricius at once nominated the young monk as his successor in the abbey and see of Caerleon, offices which David assumed a few years later on the retirement of Dubricius, who, after the manner of many of the Welsh saints, ended his days in peace and meditation on Bardsey Island (Ynys Enlli), the Lindisfarne of Wales, a rocky islet off the Carnarvonshire coast.

[1] Giraldus Cambrensis, *Life of St. Davia.*

'Then they agreed among themselves to praise David, and to acknowledge unanimously that he was a prince over the saints of Britain, saying as follows: "As God has set a governor in the sea over all kinds of fishes, and as God has given a governor on the earth over the birds, so has He given David to be a governor over men in this world; and in the same manner as God gave Matthias in Judæa, and Luke in Alexandria, and James in Jerusalem, and Peter in Rome, and Martin in France, and Samson in Brittany, He has given Saint David in the island of Britain." And therefore Saint David was made a sovereign and prince of the saints in the island of Britain on account of his preaching at this great synod to all the people.'[1]

Apart from his miraculous powers, which were already apparent to all, David was well qualified to hold the position of primate and arch-abbot, for as a grandson of Prince Ceredig he was closely allied to the saintly clan of Cunedda's descendants, and thereby also to several of the ruling Welsh families. His accession to the throne vacated by Dubricius was at once followed by a vigorous and original policy, for David speedily obtained from Prince Arthur, who then reigned at Caerlon and whom Geoffrey of Monmouth names as his nephew, the necessary permission to remove the mother-see from the western capital to the far distant but beloved headland of Menevia. Several reasons seem to have urged the saint to take this singular and momentous step. In the first place David had a natural love of his birth-place, which he ardently wished to distinguish; secondly, he was anxious to withdraw the leading monastic establishment from the neighbourhood of the British Court with its varied influences into the wilderness; thirdly, the nearness of Menevia to the Irish coast, which in clear weather is distinctly visible from St. David's Head, and the consequent opportunities of intercourse with the sister-church of Ireland, were undoubted attractions; while last, but probably far from least, the constant dread of a successful Saxon raid upon Caerleon must have alarmed the saint, whose fears were well grounded, as can be proved by the terrible fate which overtook

[1] W. J. Rees, *Lives of the Cambro-British Saints*

the great North Welsh monastery of Bangor-Iscoed, near Chester, shortly after the coming of St. Augustine.

Having once established himself and his devoted monks, now secure alike from royal interference and from the dread of a pagan incursion, in their new home above the wild cliffs of Dyfed, the saint was enabled more easily to impose his rules of conduct upon all who sought a home, whether life-long or temporary, within his monastery. St. David's discipline and method, of which an accurate description has come down to us through Gildas, were certainly severe. The day's work began at cock-crow, and consisted in manual labour on the surrounding farm and garden, wherein 'every member was an ox to himself,' after which the remaining hours of daylight were passed in reading, writing, or meditation, until the sound of the vesper-bell at sunset, when each inmate entered the church to remain there in rapt devotion 'until the appearance of the stars in the sky.' After vespers all met at the common table for supper (apparently the only meal in the twenty-four hours), and were then allowed to rest and refresh themselves 'with plain food and water, though not to excess, for too great a quantity, even of bread, produces luxury.' After supper the fraternity returned to the church for three hours of prayer before retiring to the dormitories. But hard as were the regulations for the monks and lay brethren, the rules drawn up and observed by the bishop-abbot for his own guidance were yet more rigorous.

'As to the father [David], shedding daily abundance of tears, and erfuming the mats with the sacrifice of prayer, and sweet with a double warmth of love and fragrance, he consecrated the appointed oblation of Our Lord's Body with clean hands, and so after morning prayers went alone to hear angelic discourse. Also he sought cold water at some distance, where, by remaining long therein, and becoming frozen, he might subdue the heat of the flesh. Then he passed the whole day unmoveable and unwearied in teaching, praying, kneeling, and taking care of the brethren, and of the orphans and widows, and of the needy and feeble and infirm, and of strangers, and in feeding the multitude. So he began, so he performed, and so he finished. And the rest of his vigorous discipline, although proper to be imitated, the shortness of this account prevents

us from mentioning; but he imitated the Egyptian monks, and led a life like to them.'[1]

This cenobitic life in his extreme westerly retreat was, however, often varied by visitations of the different parts of his vast diocese, and also by occasional voyages to Ireland and Cornwall, where David founded churches.[2] His devoted disciples, Teilo and Padarn, whose lives will presently be discussed, were his inseparable companions in all these wanderings, so that in the verses of the *Triads*, David, Teilo, and Padarn are described as 'the Three Blessed Visitors of Britain, who went about the country preaching the faith in Christ without pay or reward to all ranks of people.' It would be idle to enumerate or even to allude to the numberless miracles and acts attributed to the saint during his episcopal career by Giraldus Cambrensis, by Geoffrey of Monmouth, and other monkish authors; but amid all the mass of legend and of pure fiction, one authentic fact, that of a synod held at Caerleon in or about the year 565 A.D., stands out clearly. The name of 'Synod of Victory' given to this meeting, over which St. David, as leading bishop and abbot of South Wales, undoubtedly presided, proves it to have been an assembly of special importance, at which, according to some writers, the lingering taint of the Pelagian heresy was finally eradicated, or else, to follow the arguments of recent critics, St. David's new rules for the discipline of the British clergy were brought forward and adopted.

The date of the saint's death is unknown, but, on our previous supposition that he was born about the year 500 A.D., it could hardly have occurred later than 590 A.D. According to the popular legend, David was privileged to receive a Divine warning of his impending death, which took place on March 1, on which day, after performing Mass in the presence of his weeping monks and of the grief-stricken people of the neighbourhood,[3] St. David retired to his cell, and there peacefully expired. And so he was buried in his cathedral church

[1] W. J. Rees, *Lives of the Cambro-British Saints.*

[2] Four churches, Thelbridge, Ashprington, Dewstowe or Davidstow, and St. David's, Exeter, are dedicated to the Welsh patron saint.

[3] Still called in the saint's memory 'Dewisland.'

at Menevia, where his relics remained until the sack and total destruction of St. David's by Danish pirates in the tenth century, after which a convenient legend—somewhat similar to the Venetian theory of the recovery of St. Mark's body after the complete destruction by fire of San Marco itself—was invented, to announce the miraculous preservation of the saint's corpse, which was once more encased amid public rejoicing in a richly decorated shrine in the new church.

Undoubtedly great as were the reputation and popularity enjoyed by David during his long life, his posthumous fame tended to grow still wider and brighter throughout the whole of Wales. Although during life the saint's labours had in Britain itself been confined almost solely to South Wales,[1] where no less than fifty-three churches and chapels of his own foundation still recall his name, St. David had by the time of the Norman Conquest come to be regarded as the leading Cambro-British saint, and as such was canonized in 1120 A.D. by Pope Calixtus II., a step that was taken at the instance of King Henry I., who hoped by so marked an honour to the Welsh national saint to appease the general discontent in Wales caused by Anselm's recent policy of nominating Norman churchmen to Cymric sees.

'It has been observed that the reputation which St. David has acquired of being the patron saint of Wales is of modern introduction, and the observation is certainly true in the sense of the words "tutelar saint," as understood by those who compiled the romances of the Seven Champions of Christendom. It may also be said that the story of the leek and its adoption as a national emblem is not noticed by his early biographers. But these remarks should not be made with a view to disparage his memory. He has long maintained the highest station among the saints of his country; and whether the number of churches attributed to him, or his exertions in the overthrow of Pelagianism be considered, he possesses the fairest claim to such a distinction. Since the twelfth century his eminence

[1] It is curious to note that not a single church of early foundation in North Wales bears David's name, from which fact we may reasonably infer that in Wales itself the saint never penetrated north of the middle region of Powys.

has been undisputed, and the poem of Gwynfardd, written in that age, lauds him in terms as if he were second only to the Almighty.' [1]

The fame and sanctity of David's shrine at Menevia —henceforth known as Ty Dewi (David's abode) or St. David's—gradually extended beyond Wales into England, so that by the close of the eleventh century the spot had become a popular place of pilgrimage, to which were attached spiritual rewards of such value that two visits to this wild and remote headland came to be accounted as equal to a single journey to Rome itself, a theory which is summed up in the quaint hexameter:

'Roma semel quantum, bis dat Menevia tantum.'

Both William the Conqueror and the powerful Henry II. considered St. David's shrine of sufficient importance to warrant a special visit, while in November 1284, Edward I., in company with Queen Eleanor, did not fail to approach and enrich the sanctuary of the patron saint of the conquered race, whose last prince had been overthrown and slain by the English arms two years before. But during the stormy changes at the Reformation the shrine perished, and its votive gifts were scattered, after which the removal of the bishop's residence to Abergwilly so reduced the ancient importance of St. David's that finally the lonely but famous city sank into the humble village of our own times. Under such circumstances it is not strange to find that the memory of David among his countrymen grew faint and indistinct, though owing to his position of acknowledged patron saint his name, almost alone of all the early Welsh saints, has ever remained prominent and familiar in his native land.

Since the ecclesiastical revival of last century numerous modern churches in the Principality have been dedicated to St. David, but we cannot at this moment recall any representation of the saint either in carving or painting. It is, however, worth noticing that the patron saint of Wales, like his royal Jewish namesake, can be made to assume two distinct characters in sacred art. As the youthful and fervent,

[1] Rice Rees, *Essay on the Welsh Saints.*

yet modest, victor of the Pelagian heretics, St. David should be represented as a young monk in the attitude of preaching, with his feet planted on the green hillock of Brefi, and with the dove of Divine eloquence fluttering near his lips ; while, as first Bishop of Saint David's and as sage counsellor, he should be made to appear as a venerable prelate clothed in the full vestments of an archbishop.

Saint Teilo, who ranks second in importance among the South Welsh saints, was himself a great-grandson of Cunedda the Illustrious, and therefore cousin to David. As one of the 'Three Blessed Visitors,' Teilo in his youth often accompanied David on his missionary travels, and according to an ancient but most improbable tradition, undertook a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, where the three Cambro-British saints, David, Teilo, and Padarn, were all consecrated bishops by the patriarch of Jerusalem. As abbot of Llandaff, originally a daughter-house to the arch-monastery of Caerleon, Teilo is usually accounted founder and first bishop or archbishop of the present see of Llandaff, to which he was consecrated by St. David, with the assistance of the two Gallic bishops, Germanus and Lupus.

'Llandaff, from the pre-eminence of Teilo among the disciples of Dubricius, and perhaps also from the patronage of the royal house of Morganwg, became now the "arch-monastery," and its episcopal abbot the "archbishop." . . . The claims both of the bishops of St. David's and of the bishops of Llandaff to the title of archbishop were justifiable (for St. David's also was an arch-monastery), but only so long as they retained their daughter-monasteries in subordination. When the episcopate became diocesan, the reason for the title expired, and in the twelfth century it was an anachronism.'[1]

The 'Teilo churches,' as the personal foundations of this saint are designated, are said to have been nearly forty in number, of which eighteen survive, while of these eighteen no fewer than ten preserve their founder's memory in the name of Llandeilo. Beyond this fact but little that can be accounted authentic is known of Teilo, although a long legendary Life of the saint is included in the celebrated *Book of Llandaff*, the work of a twelfth-century compiler (stated on

[1] E. J. Newell, *Diocesan History of Llandaff.*

good authority to have been the monk Galfrith, brother to Urban, first Norman bishop of Llandaff), which happily escaped the wholesale plunder of the cathedral treasury at the time of the Reformation. From the pages of this valuable transcript of early Cymric tradition we learn that Teilo, perhaps in company with St. Padarn, left Wales at the time of the yellow plague (Y Fâd felen) to seek a temporary refuge in Brittany with St. Samson, bishop of Dôl, and that after some years he returned to Llandaff, where he died. The saint's birthplace is named as Penally, near Tenby, but the dates of both his birth and death are unknown, though we may assume he was born early in the sixth century and, as all accounts credit him with great age, that he died about the same year as St. David, who was slightly his senior. Teilo, whose anniversary is held on February 9, has in recent years been chosen as the patron saint of certain newly built churches in Glamorganshire, so that his long-forgotten name has once more grown tolerably familiar to the people of Wales. One curious circumstance in connexion with him is perhaps worth recording here. In an old farmhouse near the chapelry of Llandeilo, which lies in the wild district of the Preselley Mountains in Pembrokeshire, a time-honoured relic of Teilo is still preserved in the so-called skull of the saint, which was until late years used by the local peasantry in cases of illness on account of its supposed healing powers ; much as the image of the 'Santissimo Bambino' of the Church of Ara Coeli was—and is still—carried to sick beds in Rome. The existence after so many centuries of this relic, and the continued belief in its miraculous properties (especially in so strictly Nonconformist a district) are of no little historical interest, since they are doubtless connected with one of the most popular of the Teilo legends, which relates that after his death three different places—Llandaff, Llandeilo-Fawr in Carmarthenshire, and Penally, which is not far distant from the Preselley Range—each claimed the ownership of the saint's corpse. The dispute seemed incapable of a settlement, 'when, by a miracle, three bodies appeared in the room of one, so like that the real one could not be distinguished. It was there-

fore agreed to bury one body at each of the three places, trusting to the chance which of them might be the identical corpse of the saint.'[1]

In addition, it may be noted here that Teilo's brother Mabon (commemorated in the name of Llanfabon, near Llandaff) is also ranked among the Welsh saints; while his half-brother, St. Afan of Builth, became the third bishop of Llanbadarn, and the founder of two churches—one in Cardiganshire and the other in Brecknockshire—the latter of which, Llanafan-fawr, still contains his memorial gravestone, with the inscription 'Hic jacet Aveanus Episcopus.'

Padarn, or Paternus, the third of the 'Three Blessed Visitors,' was an Armorican of noble birth, who came to Wales about the time of the synod of Llandewi-Brefi, in order to study at Illtyd's college of Llantwit. As we have already stated, Padarn became a disciple and close friend of St. David, under whose auspices he founded the see of Llanbadarn—comprising North Cardiganshire and Radnorshire—at a spot formerly known as Mauritania, about a mile inland from the modern watering-place of Aberystwyth. Besides his cathedral church at Llanbadarn-Fawr (whose site is now occupied by a massive twelfth-century building), Padarn founded at least five other churches, all of them recalling his name, in the counties of Cardigan and Radnor. According to the Welsh chronicler Sulgenus, son of Sulien, Bishop of St. David's in the eleventh century, Padarn ruled his newly established see for twenty-one years, spending his days in spiritual exercises similar to those enjoined and practised by his master, Dewi—*orans, jejunans, vigilans, lachrymansque, gemensque.* By the same authority he is also said to have rebuked the powerful Maelgwyn Gwynedd, over-lord of Wales, for acts of violence and injustice; but otherwise no incident of historical value during the saint's Welsh career has been recorded. For unexplained reasons Padarn finally returned to his native Brittany, where he became Bishop of Vannes, in which capacity he subscribed to the decrees of the Council of Paris in 557 A.D. The saint 'is commended both as an abbot and a bishop in the

[1] Rice Rees, *An Essay on the Welsh Saints.*

writings of Venantius Fortunatus, a Latin poet of Gaul, who was his contemporary,' but neither the date nor place of his death are known ; although April 15 has been traditionally observed as his festival. The Welsh see founded by Padarn, and bearing his name, continued to flourish until the eighth century, when in circumstances which are very obscure it became merged in the mother diocese of St. David's.

We will now turn to an important saintly house of North Wales which, in the words of the poet Gwynfardd, was 'highly exalted, and unequalled for lineage, morality and courtesy.' This family includes the names of Dunawd, or Dinooth, founder of the ill-fated monastery of Bangor-Iscoed, which has been already mentioned ; of his three sons, Deiniol, Gwarthan and Cynwyl, or Conwil—founder of the churches of Conwil-Caio and Conwil-Elvet, in Carmarthenshire ; and of his grandson, Deiniol ap Deiniol, or Deiniolen, reputed second Bishop of Bangor. Of Dinooth's three sons Deiniol for several years aided his father in ruling the immense community of Bangor-Iscoed, but finally repaired to the Menai Straits, where he established a college known as Bangor Deiniol, to distinguish it from the parent house. Here Deiniol resided for many years, combining the practices of a hermit with the rule of an abbot, until the middle of the sixth century, when the tyrannical Prince Maelgwyn, 'growing virtuous in his old age, and making a sacrifice to God of the devil's leavings, converted the college of Bangor into a bishopric, and appointed Deiniol to be its first bishop.' [1] Beyond the fact that Prince Maelgwyn was Deiniol's acknowledged patron and benefactor, little else is known of this important saint, concerning whose life and acts the later legendary writers are almost silent. He is said to have attended the synod of Llandewi-Brefi, presumably in his youth ; to have gained no little fame as a musician and poet ; and, like most of the North Welsh saints, to have retired finally to the Isle of Bardsey, in whose sacred soil he lies buried. In the verses of the *Triads*, Deiniol is celebrated by later bards as one of the 'Three Holy Bachelors of Britain,' in company with St. Catoc and St. Madog, though this

[1] Thomas Pennant, *A Tour in Wales.*

description hardly tallies with the generally accepted belief that he was the father of Deiniolen, his successor in the see of Bangor.

Of St. Asaph, from whom the second North Welsh see derives its present name, we are vaguely informed by Giraldus Cambrensis that 'he was more especially illustrious for his descent and form, and from his childhood shone brightly both with virtues and miracles, daily endeavouring to imitate his master in all sanctity and abstinence.'[1] Asaph's master was no other than the celebrated Scottish saint, known variously as Kentigern, Mungo, and Cynderyn, who, being forced to quit his see of Glasgow about the middle of the sixth century, settled in North Wales and founded a small college on the banks of the river Elwy, where Asaph became his favourite out of many pupils. Winning over the powerful Maelgwyn to his own interests, St. Kentigern finally persuaded that prince to raise this new foundation to the rank of a bishopric, which from its site was called Llanelwy, a name still in use amongst Welsh-speaking folk. Returning to his native Glasgow about the year 560 A.D., Kentigern nominated his beloved pupil and companion, Asaph, as his successor in the vacant see of Llanelwy, which henceforth became known as St. Asaph out of compliment to its second bishop, who died towards the close of the sixth century.

To North Wales also belongs the last saint whose life we shall attempt to describe in this article: Winifred (in Welsh Brenna or Gwenfrwi), whose story belongs perhaps more to English than to Cymric hagiology, since her cult and reputation are of much later growth. According to her legend, as related by Cressy, Winifred was a damsel of noble birth and niece of the holy St. Beuno, the founder of ten churches under the patronage of Prince Cadfan. Despising marriage and all worldly cares and pleasures, Winifred, under a vow of perpetual virginity, lived a life of solitude and devotion in the midst of a forest. Here she was one day surprised by a young chieftain of the neighbourhood, Caradoc ap Alan, who, smitten with her beauty, at once

[1] Giraldus Cambrensis, *Itinerarium Kambriae.*

endeavoured to force her chastity. The terrified maiden, however, managed to escape, but was pursued and finally overtaken by Caradoc at the threshold of St. Beuno's cell in the vale of Sychnant (Drybrook). Here the prince, mad with revenge and with baulked desire, brutally slew St. Winifred by cutting off her head with his sword, and then departed before the return of Beuno and his companions, by whom the murder was discovered. The grief-stricken hermit, kneeling down by his niece's corpse, then piously joined the severed head to the bleeding trunk,

'whereupon the virgin presently rose up, as if from sleep, cleansing her face from the dust and sweat, and filled the congregation with wonder and joy. Now in the place where the head was rejoined to the body there appeared a white circle compassing the neck, small as a white thread, which continued so all her life, showing the place where the section had been made. And the report in that country (Wales) is that from this white circle she had the name of Winifred given her, whereas at first she had been called Brenna; for in the British language *win* signifies white.'

But Winifred's restoration to life was by no means the only miracle performed on this occasion, for on the very spot where the maiden's head had fallen to earth, there now gushed forth a plenteous spring in the dry barren soil of Sychnant—a circumstance which will at once recall a similar legend concerning St. Paul's execution outside the Ostian Gate of Rome, at the place afterwards known in consequence as the Three Fountains. From this date onward Winifred shared her uncle's cell and ministered to his wants until he died, while reports of her wonderful restoration to life, of her many virtues, and of the healing properties of her miraculous fountain, won the maiden saint much fame during her lifetime which lasted fifteen years after her decapitation. Like Deborah of old, Winifred was often consulted on questions of national importance, and the intense love of truth shown in her judgements gained her the local epithet of 'The Candid Winifred.' In spite, however, of the alleged powers and popularity of Winifred and her well in early times, it is curious and instructive to note that in the survey of Flintshire recorded by Domesday Book no mention

whatever is made of church, chapel, or well belonging to this saint, so that it is not unnatural to conclude that her elaborate biography is almost wholly an invention of post-Norman times, put forward to account for the undoubted medical value of the waters at Holywell that bear her name. In the Middle Ages these waters were frequently used with good results in cases of rheumatism and skin eruptions—the two ills from which humanity mostly suffered during a period of utter ignorance of hygiene and medicine—so that the neighbouring abbey of Basingwerk was enabled to reap no small gains out of the fees of visitors to St. Winifred's Well. So great grew the reputation of the spring and its tutelar saint, that a special guild was formed at Shrewsbury, having for a device on its seals and banners the representation of Winifred's martyrdom—a crowned and bearded savage in the act of beheading a beautiful virgin.

So deep-rooted and widespread was the public belief in these sacred and beneficent waters, that the new laws and new ideas of the Reformation quite failed to arrest the popular habit of resorting to this spot, which is probably the only shrine in Great Britain that has been continuously sought by the sick and the pious from the early ages of Christianity down to the present day. In August 1686, James II., while the guest of the notorious Bishop Cartwright at Chester, paid a special visit—the last royal pilgrimage on British soil—with a numerous train to Holywell, where the king gave memorial rings to certain Roman Catholic gentlemen of the place, and was himself solemnly presented by a local Welsh squire with the blood-stained shift of his great-grandmother, Mary, Queen of Scots. Thomas Pennant, writing in the latter half of the eighteenth century, notes the declining but still considerable vogue of the well during his visit to Flintshire:

'The resort of pilgrims of late years to these Fontanalia has considerably decreased; the greatest number are from Lancashire. In the summer still a few are to be seen in the water in deep devotion up to their chins for hours, sending up their prayers, or performing a number of evolutions round the polygonal well, or threading the

arch between well and well a prescribed number of times. Few people of rank at present honour the fountain with their presence, and the majority of these are of the fair sex. . . . The spring is certainly one of the finest in the kingdom, and by the two different trials and calculations, lately made for my information, is found to fling out about twenty-one tons of water in a minute. It never freezes ; and scarcely varies in the quantity of water in droughts or after the greatest rains.'[1]

The same writer also mentions the two rose-coloured fragrant mosses covering the stones round the well, which the popular myth of Winifred ascribed to the stains of the saint's blood, and credited with curative powers. Pennant, after examination, pronounced them to be a *jungermannia* and a *byssus*, mosses which are noted by Linnæus as being of some value in cases of eczema. Of the recently revived popularity of the well, and of the efforts made by certain well-meaning Roman Catholics to transform it into a Welsh imitation of Lourdes, it is unnecessary to speak in these pages.

We may complete our account of St. Winifred with a few remarks on the obscure nature of the position and the obligations of female saints in the early Cambro-British Church. It is remarkable how comparatively few holy women (and those chiefly connected with the Irish house of Brychan) are included in the long list of nearly five hundred Welsh saints ; while it is fairly certain that there were no regular nunneries existing in Wales at this period. Many of the recognized female saints, who were founders of churches and in whose memory festivals were kept, are described as having been the wives or mothers of princes or of holy men ; nor have we any reason to assume that in their widowhood they gave up a life of secular occupation. The principle of taking vows of life-long chastity, which is of Gallican and not of British origin, was undoubtedly introduced into Wales by St. Germanus, who, as we know, prior to his departure for our island, himself gave the veil to the fourteen-year old Geneviève, afterwards patron saint of the city of Paris, at her earnest request. But whatever the causes may have been,

[1] Thomas Pennant, *A Tour in Wales.*

this imported custom of female celibacy never became popular in Wales, and St. Winifred remains one of the few Cymric saints who, according to tradition, definitely made an early sacrifice of her virginity to the service of God.

In conclusion, we are fully aware how lightly and imperfectly we have in these pages touched upon our subject. It is one of equal value and interest to the historian and to the hagiologist, since a study of the Cambro-British saints not only discloses a large number of gracious personalities and characteristic legends, but also throws a strong light on the dark ages of Welsh history, so that we can understand more clearly the primitive society of the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries. To those who are anxious to hear more of the founders of the Welsh Church, and thereby to study the earlier annals of Wales itself, we recommend the reading of the opening chapters in the diocesan histories of the four Welsh sees, to be followed later by a perusal of Rice Rees' *Essay on the Welsh Saints*, an exhaustive and brilliantly written treatise, which, ever since its appearance nearly seventy years ago, has been accounted the classic work on the hagiology, and consequently on the early ecclesiastical history, of Wales.

HERBERT M. VAUGHAN.

Art. III.—WILLIAM ARCHER BUTLER.

1. *Sermons, Doctrinal and Practical.* By the Rev. W. Archer Butler, M.A. Edited, with a Memoir of the Author's Life, by the Revs. T. Woodward, M.A., and J. A. Jeremie, D.D. Tenth Edition. 2 vols. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1882.)
2. *Letters on the Development of Christian Doctrine in Reply to J. H. Newman's Essay.* By the Rev. W. A. Butler. Edited by Rev. T. Woodward, M.A. (Dublin, 1850.)
3. *Lectures on the History of Ancient Philosophy.* By Professor W. A. Butler. Edited by W. H. Thompson, M.A. 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1856.) Second edition, 1 vol. (1875).
4. *Private and Unpublished Letters and Papers.*

The interest in the fortunes of Trinity College, Dublin, which has been excited by the Report of the Royal Commission and the ill-advised attempts of the present Government to solve the problem of Irish University education by methods which are generally condemned by educational authorities, and unacceptable to the majority of the Irish people,[1] makes it not inappropriate to recall to the minds of our readers the memory of one whom his college accounts among the most distinguished of her teachers, and who is still remembered as one of the greatest preachers in the Church of Ireland.

William Archer Butler was the first Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in the University of Dublin, and his lectures, published after his death, amply testify to his philosophical powers. He was also a graceful poet, whose poems, many of which exist only in manuscript, might well deserve to be rescued from oblivion. As a controversialist he was the worthy opponent of Cardinal Newman, among the many answers to whose *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* Butler's was considered by so good a judge as Bishop Thirlwall to be the best. But it is

[1] *Cf.* 'Irish University Education and the Reform of Trinity College, Dublin,' *C.Q.R.* Oct. 1906.

as a preacher that he is best remembered. His sermons, written for the most part before he was thirty years of age, and published, unrevised, after his death, have passed through no less than ten editions, and are to this day widely known and valued. A very brief and meagre memoir was prefixed by Dean Woodward to the first volume of them. It consists largely of extracts from his youthful speeches and poems, and the strictly biographical matter in it could be condensed into a few pages. This it is our intention to supplement in the present article by the aid of his letters, journals, and manuscript poems which have come into our hands.

William Archer Butler was born at Annerville, near the town of Clonmel, Co. Tipperary, about the end of 1812 or beginning of 1813. There exists no record of the date of his birth, but in a brief journal written in 1832 he states he was then 'about twenty years of age.'[1] His father, Pierce Archer Butler, was a member of the Established Church; but through the influence of his mother, who was a Roman Catholic, he and his six brothers and sisters were all brought up in that communion. The father seems from the very first to have been struck with the talents of William, who was his second son.

'As soon as he could speak,' we are told, 'William was made to recite Shakespeare and by degrees the speeches of modern orators, with appropriate gestures, and even when he was four or five years old taught to be very distinct in pronunciation. At the age of nine he was sent to the Endowed School in Clonmel, where special attention was paid to oratory and he was encouraged to think over and invent speeches for their exhibitions.'

He was a dreamy child, loving solitude, and delighting in the beautiful scenery around his uncle's place, Garnavilla, which was situated on the bank of the Suir and near the Galtee mountains. He took no part in the games of his schoolfellows, who probably did not understand his tastes and pursuits, so that he thought himself shunned by them;

[1] This will justify us in setting back Prof. Dowden's date (1814?) in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* s.v. by at least a year.

nevertheless, we are told, he was universally popular on account of his amiability and playful wit. He was thus one of those *spiritual* characters who ever and anon appear among men. One who was much conversant with the manhood of America in the time of the Civil War tells us how in camp or hospital he sometimes met with

'specimens of unworldliness, disinterestedness, and animal purity and heroism—perhaps some unconscious Indianian or from Ohio or Tennessee, on whose birth the calmness of heaven seems to have descended and whose gradual growing up . . . the power of a strange spiritual sweetness, fibre, and inward health have also attended. Something veiled or abstracted is often a part of the manners of these beings . . . their companions only understanding that they are different from the rest, more silent, "something odd about them," and apt to go off and muse and meditate in solitude.' [1]

Archer Butler spent his leisure hours in reading poetry and philosophy, and before he left school the precocious boy was an ardent admirer of the writings of Francis Bacon, and had not only studied the works of many of the chief Scotch metaphysicians but had plunged for himself into the problems of Being, and found that the study of philosophy was his best loved pursuit. He ranged abroad also over the wide fields of literature, so that in after years we find him lamenting the possession of 'that mortal foe to steady determination, a boundlessly romantic spirit, fostered by the thousand volumes of ruinous lore which my younger days have fed on.' From his earliest years he was deeply religious, and his moral feelings extraordinarily sensitive. He was also conscientious in observing all the requirements of his religion; [2] but we are informed that on one occasion when he attended confession, feeling his spirit burdened with a sense of sinfulness, and hoping to find

[1] Walt Whitman, *Specimen Days in America.*

[2] 'For long hours of the night he would lie prostrate on the ground, filled with remorse for offences which would not for one moment have disturbed the self-complacency of even well-conducted youths' (Woodward).

relief, his confessor was unsympathizing and treated these secrets of his soul as if they were morbid imaginations, and threw all his poignant emotions back upon himself. The moral nature of the earnest youth received a shock, and from that time he began to inquire and to examine the grounds of his faith, with the result that before long he passed from Roman Catholicism and became a faithful son of the Church of Ireland. His four sisters subsequently followed him, the other brothers remained in the Roman communion; but the diversity of their religious opinions did not interfere with the warm attachment which existed always between the members of the family.

In 1829 Butler entered Trinity College, Dublin. He pursued the same plan of wide but desultory studies as before, and studied classics for their contents rather than as a grammarian or philologist. He was elected to a Classical Scholarship, however, in 1832; among his fellow scholars that year were Isaac Butt, the son of a Donegal clergyman, and Charles Graves, afterwards Bishop of Limerick. Woodward testifies that his fellow students felt that Archer Butler possessed a master mind, which could charm by the playfulness of its fancy while it astonished by the vastness of its intellectual resources. He was at once recognized as possessing great rhetorical powers, and his magnificent address delivered in 1834 at the opening of the session of the College Historical Society, of which he was auditor that year, was never forgotten by those who heard it.

His chief joy during the eight years he resided in college seems to have been writing reviews, essays, and poems for the *Dublin University Magazine* and for *Blackwood's*. Every year he won a prize in the University for a poetic or prose composition. His essays in the reviews were highly thought of at the time, and among them a sympathetic article on Goldsmith and two articles on Bishop Berkeley are good examples of his happy style.[1]

He possessed in a high degree the poetical temperament, and delighted to pour out his feelings in verse. In his *Remembrances of a Poetical Childhood* he describes his

[1] *Dublin University Magazine*, April and May 1836.

eagerness in the acquisition of knowledge, his disgust at the criminal records of history, and his upward progress through philosophy to religion.

'Thus summers passed; and radiant knowledge broke
Apace upon my kindled soul . . .
Then swelled the unfolding energies, then rose
The mental arm of stronger grasp—the doom
Of deeper glance and more despairing woes
That filled the poet's history. . . .

'Books and the teeming wonders of the earth
Surcharged my soul with thought, from cloud to wave
Nature was big with miracles—her mirth
Gleamed in the laughing sky; the tempest's rave [*sic*]
Uttered the mighty music of her wrath.
At night she murmured peace and mystic dreams
When, bending from her star-inwoven path,
She slow undrew the curtained web of beams
That hides her field of lustrous worlds from day;
All this I felt, yet *how* my lips would feebly say.

'And lettered wisdom too, transfusing thought
From soul to soul, gave comments to these scenes,
Enlarged the bounds of Reason's realm and brought
A thousand minds to one. Thus Art convenes
Her council of the great of perished ages
In living hearts, and quickens buried truth
To life immortal on her pictured pages.
These gave the lore of manhood to my youth,
These spread my soul abroad through every clime,
And multiplied my life the tenant of all time.

'I read of mightiest empires, gorgeous kings
The fierce, the fallen! I traced the awful course—
—As some majestic river's wanderings,
Calm to the eye but torrent-strong in force—
Of that Arch-Ruler's will enthroned on Fate,
Which moulds the chaos of our deeds to good.
From age to age, from scene to scene, elate
Sprung the untiring soul, and keenly viewed
The varied man—alas! 'twas varied vice,
I loathed the dark detail that chilled my heart to ice.

'The volume dropped. I fled the tale of man,
And sank in dim abstractions, shapes of air
Invoked by mild Philosophy. I ran
Through sects and systems,—taught my soul to dare
Question herself and in her secret shrine
Explore the mystery of her being's aim,
The wherefore of her nature and design.
Dim the response; but light celestial came
Whence only it hath ever come. I trod
With fearful steps and slow the temple-court of God.
And now the glory of supernal grace
Flooded my soul with wonder.'

Butler's poems in the opinion of a great living critic (Dr. Dowden) give an impression of the affluence of his mind, and he considers even the least excellent of them to possess value as the outpourings of a very elevated heart and brain.

A brief journal, begun in 1832, and continuing only for a period of six months, shews us that, though Butler was outwardly living so full a life, the subject of religion held a foremost place in his heart. It displays the deep humility and self-depreciation so commonly seen in the 'confessions' of holy men. In his sermon on 'Self-Delusion' he speaks on this subject.

'Were a perfect man to exist, he himself would be the last to know it, for the highest stage of advancement is the lowest descent of humility. As long as this humility is necessary to the fulness of the Christian character, it would seem to be of the essence of constant growth in grace to see itself lowlier as God exalts it higher!'

'Thus,' he adds, 'the spirit of man as it becomes relatively more perfect may be said to feel itself absolutely less so.'[1]

'Saturday, August 25, 1832.—There are various snares for various minds. The perusal of the works of those philosophic Christians who tread on the brink of infidelity, and love to bid their readers stoop over the giddy precipice is one to me, unsettling my mind as much as, if not more than, treatises of professed impiety. Formal arguments we may gird our minds resolutely to examine and resist, but the undefined impression

[1] *Sermons* (1849), p. 144.

produced by books of pleasing fiction, &c., which present views of the world unconnected with a presiding Spirit and redeeming Saviour, lulls our apprehensions to sleep and poisons slowly.

'Sunday, August 26.—Alas! "it shone no Sabbath day for me," if the Sabbath be measured by the feelings which should attend it. In the attendance on public worship I gained as little advantage as usual. I do not know whether I am singular in finding this attendance only a snare of vanity. It is a fine thought indeed that all the Christian world are at the same moment engaged in offering up supplication to their common Master; but the crowd produces a wandering of thought—a difficulty in concentrating its attention on its mighty task—a seeking for the suffrages of my fellow-men rather than for the ear of God.'

'Saturday, September 15.—Very feeble and depressed do I experience my spirit this day, and for some preceding ones. The man who contends with the world may be perpetually reminded of Virgil's comparison of the rower in a rapid current; he must never sleep, for his adversary never sleeps; a moment of exhaustion may dissolve the labour of days, and thus, with occasional desires for the better country, my spiritual system bends under the force of, not direct assaults, but undermining impressions. I am the denizen of a family circle in which, from morn till eve, religion never seems to appear. Thus a weak mind like mine perpetually forgets its higher birth, and, as many others, I am disgusted with the frivolity of those around me, yet become a participator in their criminal indolence. Am I after all to be one of the thousand, one of the fluttering dreamers? Horrible thought! no interest in Christ—no anchorage in Heaven—no adoption from the Father. Hatred for earth and no love for Heaven! Oh! is there in nature a more contemptible character than mine, an indolent fastidious thing, that cannot but despise the nothingness of this life's practices, yet is utterly unable to pursue the plain course of happiness; an embodying of that emphatic phrase, "Video meliora, proboque, deteriora sequor?"'

His commonplace book, which belongs to this time of his life, is full of extracts from many and various authors in different languages, and on many subjects both literary and scientific. It is interspersed with frequent thoughts of his own, and scattered here and there on its pages are to be found condensed pregnant fragments of thought to which

he gives the name of 'Laconics.' They illustrate both the originality of his thoughts and his power to give them striking expression :

'The English people, like a bridge, grow stronger the more that is laid upon them.'

'Toryism, the Calvinism of politics, builds ultimately its philosophy upon the deep corruption of human nature as its main theoretical principle; Whiggery, the Arminianism of politics, upon the loftiness and perfectibility of that nature. Hence the young (who imagine they can reach and reform everything) tend to the latter; the old and experienced (who have felt that a secret obstacle of depravity resists everything) to the former.'

'History is the detail of the Past, illumined by the experience of the Present, and directed to anticipate the Future.'

'No extravagance so often wears the garb of a virtue as mistaken resolution. Some men act not because they *now* think action their duty, but because they once thought so. They are in resolution what the famous astrologer was in prediction—who prophesied his own death on a certain day and then hanged himself to fulfil his prophecy. Is it not absurd that a man should argue, "I ought to act thus because I promised to do so," and not rather "I promise myself to act thus because I ought to do so," to make duty depend on determination, not determination on duty?'

'There is no personal identity in parties. Hence never be influenced by the promises of a party. They may be sincere at the moment, but next year they are actually not the same party who made the promise. This may be very dishonest, but it is very true; they are actually not conscious of their own falsehood; they have no preservation of consciousness, no continued identity!'

'Solitude improves great and injures little minds.'

'Love's deadliest enemy is to have none to overthrow.'

'There is a strong love of existence and a doubting hope nourished almost involuntarily in the mind which I am persuaded render the prospect of annihilation to the unbeliever more intolerable than the probability of misery and the dim possibility of happiness.'

'The great religious use of solitude flows from the natural hostility of man to that state, however paradoxical it may seem. For the mind when in solitude feels the want of beings on which

to exhaust its affections—it seeks something to love. But not possessing these beings in reality, it is driven to an ideal world, and centres its hopes and love and the fond fulness of its communion upon the Great Being whom we adore in the secrecy of the heart! This is true, for it is my own experience.'

'The faculty of a poetic imagination is only a pure, refined, and acute vision, a sight which sees more than the vulgar eye can recognise.'

'All Christ's miracles are of mercy; nearly the very first of the apostles' a miracle of judgment.'

'The mind possesses little of that power so strikingly possessed by the body, of resisting the influence of temperature, of remaining unchanged, though surrounded by enormous heat and cold.'

'Much of the overweening admiration and recommendation of special bodily austerities in the early Church arose, doubtless, from the frequency of the contemplative life. For there, the opportunities of actual worldly discipline being few, it seemed (and really was to a great degree) necessary to devise studied modes of self-conquest. These are, in most cases, absolutely unnecessary to those who carry on the Christian life and warfare in the actual world. *There* almost every turn of life—conversation, action, &c.—furnishes us with an opportunity of mortification; we need not go out of the public school of the world for any private practice. And there can be no doubt this latter mode of discipline is much *superior* both in variety and *genuine* probation. Men disciplining themselves in cells and deserts unawares flatter their own weaknesses in even their very tortures. The difference is that between bodily exercise in a private gymnasium and the actual exertion of a *real* wrestling-match or race; or it is the difference between a musician's practice of his own preludes, which he unconsciously suits to his own previous capabilities and tastes, and the practice of a new series of studies written by other composers without any relation to *his* special powers. Every practical musician knows how very different is the value of these exercises as a means of attaining true skill on the instrument.'

'The "charity" of St. Paul (in 1 Cor. xiii.) seems best described, if under any single notion, as *the opposite to selfishness* taking that term in the largest sense, the grace which habituates man in everything to lose and resign *self*. Whether in favour of God or of our neighbour, it is still the same humble, unforced,

habitual forgetfulness of self. And thus it is at the same time distinguished from mere "self-denial" by being done with perfect ease and happiness; it is thence a far higher attainment. It is no longer so much a *denial* of self as an oblivion of self: the self-sacrifice becomes almost unconscious from the mind and heart being fixed, not upon their own state, but upon the object of their affection.'

The following brief poem illustrates his power of expressing fresh thoughts in words not wanting in the 'natural magic' of true poetry:

'THE VOICE OF FRIENDSHIP.

'Oh, hush! *Thou* canst not teach me to distrust
The world's bright seeming; other lips than thine
Must teach me earthly beauty is but dust,
That we can friendship change, or love resign.

'As well the rose might with its scented breath,
And crimson leaves moist with the dew of Heaven,
Proclaim its birthplace as a vale of death,
Where the reed boweth and the oak is riven.

'Thou art so lovely in thy flowery youth,
A sadder voice must tell of death to me;
So constant art thou in thy guileless truth,
Oh! I may learn distrust, but not of thee.

'Ah, no, a sweeter duty shall be thine,
When I have learned Earth's coldest, sternest word,
When faith misplaced has caused me to repine,
And dark forebodings have my spirit stirred,

'Then shall the music of thy tones remind me,
Like breath of roses on a wintry day,
That howsoe'er the drifting storm may blind me,
Not *all* the beautiful hath passed away!'

The following lines also illustrate his possession of the true poetic gift:

'So the blind pupil of a blessed art
Feels her dim way along the indented page,
Her quick touch ministrant to sightless orbs,
While meanings mantle o'er her upraised face,
Like converse with an unseen visitant
Or strange revealings of an inward light.'

'Our hearts are prophets of the coming time—
Our hopes—our fears—our very recollections—
Each earthly throb holds promises sublime
And all the future burns in man's affections.'

It was urged upon Archer Butler by his friends that he ought to choose the law as his profession, but he shrank from the turmoil of the law courts. He loved literature and moral science, and his habits and pursuits inclined him strongly to a university life. About the year 1833 his thoughts began to incline him to the Christian ministry as a calling for which his talents were suited.

'My mind is almost made up' (he wrote to his eldest sister), 'every additional hour's consideration fixes it more strongly on my mind that every motive which can influence a rational being in choosing the colour of his life fixes me in the Church . . . . my main reason is a conviction of my own impressible weakness, and a certainty that to enter the legal profession—the most utterly worldly in existence—would be in effect to systematically banish reflexion; while, frail and unsettled as I now am, to enter the Church would be to place my mind in the very *sunshine* of religious feeling—where from the very nature of my profession it is impossible but religion must accost me every hour. But you know that to others this mightiest of all imaginable arguments may appear wholly unintelligible. Well, then, to them I may mention the worldly advantages of this course. Every man should examine his own powers and act by that examination. Now I do not hesitate to say that if I pursue the Law, there are ten chances to one against my ever attaining worldly eminence; and that the very qualifications, whatever be their degree, which form my *forte* would actually disqualify me for legal eminence. My powers, such as they are, lie almost entirely on the side of the imagination. They are the powers which would lie dormant in law; they are the very powers which would come into full play in the Church. They are the powers which it is but one case in a hundred gives scope to in the law (such as a case of false imprisonment, seduction, liberty of the Press invaded, or some such), where an ornate speech is required; while they are the powers that every Sunday's sermon calls for in the Church. . . . On the whole I do really think that even on these temporal grounds the case is decidedly in favour of the Church. When I think of the Law, life seems a path of toil ending in a

comfortless death ; when I think of the Church, it brightens into a pleasing and glorious service not unlikely to bring " the favour of man " as well as of God, and ending in undescribable bliss.'

In 1834 Provost Lloyd introduced the system of Moderatorships, with gold or silver medals, at the degree examination in Dublin University. At first there were only three subjects in which these distinctions could be gained, namely, Classics, Mathematics, and Logic and Ethics. William Archer Butler was the first graduate of the University to gain a Moderatorship in Mental and Moral Science. After this he continued to reside in Trinity College for two and a half years, until a happy turn took place in his affairs through the wise discrimination of the Provost. The latter perceived the young graduate's extraordinary abilities, and caused a professorship in Philosophy to be founded in 1837, to the chair of which he was appointed, being at the same time presented to the prebend of Clondehorka, in the diocese of Raphoe, Co. Donegal.

'Is not this' (he writes) 'a great favour of Providence ? Suddenly to be placed on an elevation so distinguished as to hold (*actually created for me*) such a post as Stewart and Brown and Reid held and Wilson holds ! And to have joined with it that peaceful pastoral care which always formed one of my fondest dreams of life. . . . I am earnestly hoping that I may be worthy of my calling—and I feel some encouragement in the state of my heart—but I can say nothing until I am fairly embarked in it as to whether I am fit to carry and happy in carrying the standard of my Redeemer.'

He was ordained deacon by the Bishop of Ardagh on May 4, 1837, and priest a few months later. He soon adapted himself to his new life, which with its union of contemplation and action was almost an ideally suitable one to a man of his tastes. He rejoiced that once more his lot lay in the country, and in a district so picturesque as Donegal. This county has a character and charm of its own, with its deep land-locked bays and rocky shores, its peaty moors and barren mountains, its rain and mists and brown rushing rivers. The people also are unlike any other in Ulster ;

they are a western race, gentle and melancholy, a deep-feeling and affectionate people.

A brief register of his days and studies, begun in 1839, shews how strenuous was the life Archer Butler led in his new sphere. He seems not to have had the assistance of a curate, except when he left Dunfanaghy to take up his studies in Dublin as Professor of Philosophy. He preached and lectured in his parish very frequently—sometimes in as many as six places during one week. He catechized the children in the schools twice a week for two hours. Besides visiting his parishioners he read many hours daily at philosophy and theology, wrote up his lectures, and composed his sermons for delivery in Dublin churches, or prepared speeches on the education question or some other subject of the day, for he was already becoming widely known as a speaker and preacher. He sometimes went to Dublin for a single day to preach or speak, making the long coach journey in twenty-four hours each way. His register shews that he studied widely on the Church and its history. He read the Apostolic Fathers. He frequently read a book of three hundred or four hundred pages in a day.

'*Sunday, July* 14, 1839.—Read Newman on justification—a noble writer surely! *24th* inst., noted some pages of harmony.' (Woodward speaks of his 'exquisite skill in music' and his care to instruct the village choir.) 'Read *Tracts for the Times*, No. 80 (83 pages). *October* 20.—Scaled Muckish mountain. *November* 1.—Wrote half a lecture on Platonic Philosophy. *November* 2.—Wrote the other half of lecture. Good work these two days.' At a great meeting in Belfast in July 1840 he delivered a speech on religious education, which was printed afterwards and attracted much attention. He also journeyed to Leeds and Liverpool, and spoke and preached for Dr. Hook on the same subject. The *British Critic* (June 1840) speaks highly of two sermons on education,[1] published by him at that time, calling them 'a noble testimony from the sister University to genuine Catholic doctrine.' Many letters were written to him in appreciation of these sermons,

[1] See *Sermons* (1849), p. 507.

among others by the Archbishop of Canterbury and J. H. Newman. 'May the zeal and devotion thus evinced,' says the latter, 'meet with abundant fruit in Ireland. Our Church could do anything humanly speaking, if it knew its own strength, and if its members were at peace with each other.'

He sometimes had visitors. '*August* 6, 1840.—In the evening came Professor Sewell, Lord Adare (afterwards Lord Dunraven), &c. &c., hither. *7th.*—Sailed to Tory Island. *8th.*—Most of the party left Dunfanaghy. Lord Adare remained here.' During term Butler resided in Trinity College, Dublin, and lectured twice a week on philosophy. He was thus absent from his parish for four months in the year. While in Dublin he preached 'passim,' as his register states. We have an entry, 'Preached at the Molyneux Asylum for the blind. An immense crowd present, and the collection amounted to 18*l.*'

The subject of his published lectures was the *History of Ancient Philosophy*. They were written when he was about twenty-eight years of age, and were published in 1856, long after his death, by Professor Thompson of Cambridge, afterwards Master of Trinity. In the preface he gives an appreciation of Butler's contributions to philosophy. The masterly *Letters on Development* led him 'to rank him among the most gifted spirits of his generation.' At that time little had been published in England on the history of Ancient Philosophy, and this book was warmly welcomed.

The earlier series is spoiled to a great degree by the rhetorical pomp of style. The lectures on Plato and the Platonists shew that Butler had carefully studied the original authorities. Thompson called them 'a perfectly independent contribution to our knowledge of the great master of Grecian wisdom.'

'Of the Dialectic and Physics of Plato they are the only exposition at once accurate and popular with which I am acquainted, being more accurate than the French and incomparably more popular than the German treatises on those departments of Plato's philosophy. The lectures on Plato's successors are concluded with a brilliant one on Neo-Platonism. . . . Taken as a whole the lectures constitute a history of the Platonic

philosophy—its seed-time, maturity, and decay, and it is no slight honour to the University of Dublin (he concludes) to have furnished such a history, written by an uncompromising defender of Catholic truth as well as of the historical evidences of Christianity.'[1]

He also speaks of his intimate acquaintance with the metaphysical writings of the eighteenth century, and especially with the English and Scotch school of psychology. J. T. Ball, afterwards Lord Chancellor of Ireland, was among the listeners in the lecture room, which was always crowded. 'Butler,' he says, 'possessed that singular faculty of rapidly assimilating all varieties of intellectual aliment which gives to some men the power of mastering books and systems by seizing at once the fundamental ideas, while others are losing their way among the details.'

Critics of that day discerned in these lectures the rapid growth of his mind, and were even more strongly impressed by what the author was capable of than by what he achieved.[2] Sir William Hamilton considered the book to possess great scientific value on account of the learning and acuteness with which the subject was treated. It was for a time part of the course of philosophy in Trinity College, Dublin, but has long been superseded by more modern works.

Archer Butler was indefatigable in visiting his parishioners, especially the sick. The members of his flock, which numbered more than two thousand, were scattered over an extensive district along the shores of the Atlantic. A clergyman who visited the parish seven years after his incumbency described the love and veneration of the people for his memory as absolutely marvellous. They spoke of his fine bodily presence, his great love of the children, and his limitless generosity. It was said of him at the time of his death that his best panegyric was the deep-toned sorrow of all who knew him in the character of a pastor. Parochial work in those days was no doubt less exacting than it is now, but it is stated that 'in the abodes of misery, by the death-beds of the poor, in scenes of famine and contagion

[1] *Lectures on Ancient Philosophy*, Preface, pp. x, xi.

[2] *Edinburgh Review*, July 1856.

he was ever active as a ministering angel. His lofty speculations were in a moment cheerfully laid aside at every call of sorrow and of suffering.'

In 1842 he was preferred to the living of Raymochy, on Lough Swilly, and reappointed to his professorship for another period of five years. His life in his new parish was but a continuation of the life of earnest study and steady pastoral work which he led during his five years at Dunfanaghy. The outline of each year's occupation is the same; at the end of November he left his parish in charge of a curate, and taking up his residence in Trinity College lectured three times a week during the short term before Christmas. He then usually proceeded to his brother's place, Garnavilla, near Clonmel, to see his sisters, and while spending a month or six weeks there enjoyed a good deal of the pleasant society, military and civilian, of the neighbourhood. He also preached in the churches round about, for wherever he was his services as a preacher were in incessant demand. In those days men were better listeners than they are at present, for he records that his sermon on February 12, 1843, at St. Michan's Church, Dublin, occupied an hour and a quarter in delivery. In February and March he continued his work as Professor of Moral Philosophy, and lectured in Trinity College, and in April or May he returned to his parish to devote his whole time again to his parishioners and his severe course of studies. The Church population of Raymochy parish at that time was about 430. The average congregation was 111, of monthly communicants 42, and at Easter and Christmas 90. There were many Presbyterians also in the parish and a large Roman Catholic population. Dr. Ball, afterwards Lord Chancellor, tells us that during the session of 1842 Butler delivered ethical lectures, and that they were more practical in their bearing and simpler in their style. His audience fancied that his clerical experience had sobered his tendency to theory and abstraction, and that he seemed more anxious while on this ground to do general good than to dazzle his audience with either subtle refinement or brilliant conceptions. These lectures were delivered extempore, and the 'solemn and

methodical' style of his written lectures on the history of philosophy was exchanged for one characterized rather by a familiarity and practical earnestness suited to a theme so immediately coming home to men's daily lives. The notes of these lectures shew that they were on the history of ethical philosophy.

It was shortly after his promotion to Raymochy that he preached at the visitation of the diocese of Derry and Raphoe. This sermon, 'Primitive Church Principles not Inconsistent with Universal Christian Sympathy,' was published at the time.[1] He takes a high view of the importance of the primitive system of the Church as the express creation of her Master and as the ordinary revealed instrument of His blessings to man, but he urges that there are real graces external to the apostolic succession. 'We may fairly take the facts (of piety, &c.) as proofs that it was not God's purpose absolutely to confine His gifts to it, *whatever may have been the anticipation of the primitive Church, which was without that experience.*' Butler was undoubtedly in his day in the front rank as a preacher and speaker. As a rule he spoke from very brief notes, but during the earlier years of his ministry his more elaborate discourses were written out beforehand and either delivered from memory or read. A second volume of his sermons was edited in 1856 by James A. Jeremie, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, who says of the sermons contained in it, 'They are marked by the same originality and vigour of expression, the same richness of imagery and illustration, the same views and catholic spirit, and the same depth and fervour of devotional feeling which so remarkably distinguished the preceding series.'

Dean Woodward tells us that Butler frequently interposed spoken passages even in his carefully written sermons, and adds that 'his finely modulated voice, his earnest manner, his animated delivery all commanded the attention, while his well laid emphasis continually marked the prominent idea and threw a light upon trains of thought which without such an aid the reader may sometimes find it

[1] See vol. i. of his *Sermons*, p. 458.

difficult to follow.' His style of preaching to cultivated congregations was compared by his friends to Massillon's. The present Archbishop of Armagh in a private letter (March 1902) sums up his recollection of Butler as a preacher and a man in these words: 'He was the man of most transcendent genius I have ever met and one of the sweetest and kindliest of the sons of men.' Long before, Mr. Alexander, when curate of Londonderry, in preaching in the cathedral on the Sunday after Archer Butler's death, had spoken of him as

'struck down in the midst of a career of usefulness, with a glowing prospect opened before his advancing footsteps, possessed of a mind just beginning to feel and to put forth its native vigour, at the meridian of an eloquence as rich in thought and matter as it was prodigally exuberant of beauty, combining great power with great promptitude, making his massive faculties even more considerable by a versatile gracefulness in using them . . . . Gifted with the indescribable winningness of genius, humble as a child and of a lovableness of character for which natural goodness of heart could never account.'

He refers to the ordination sermon preached a few weeks before.

'Surely until we are borne like him to the cold grave there will be enshrined in the inmost casket of recollection the love that glowed in his manner and in his voice as he unfolded the spiritual meaning of that passage of St. John, "Who is he that overcometh the world but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?"'

Spending four or five months each year in Dublin Butler was eagerly sought for as a preacher, and was frequently heard in the University pulpit, in the Chapel Royal (he had been appointed chaplain to the Lord Lieutenant in 1841), or in St. Stephen's or other parochial churches. His name is still warmly cherished in his own University as one of her most brilliant sons during the nineteenth century; he was the subject of a celebration sermon no longer ago than Trinity Monday 1906, a day on which every year some former alumnus is commemorated at a festival service

held before the annual banquet for scholars past and present.

Dean Woodward gives a record of the impression which Archer Butler made on his intimate friends in his private life.

'It was in the unreserved intercourse of friendly conversation that the faculties of Professor Butler seemed to find their happiest exercise. His multifarious knowledge was communicated on the most trivial suggestion, yet without effort or display. The profound reflexion, the subtle analysis, the most pungent wit dropped from him in brilliant succession, while he appeared entirely unsconcious that he was speaking more than ordinary words.'

Alas! not one fragment of his conversation has come down to us.

It is by his sermons, however, that Archer Butler is best remembered. He possessed the rare combination of analytical power and poetical imagination, that true genius which begins by condensation and generalization and goes on to realization and expansion. Hence, whether he is preaching for a charitable institution, such as an asylum for the blind, treating of some theological mystery, such as the Trinity or the existence of evil, or enforcing some practical duty, he goes at once to first principles, but he treats them so devotionally as to commend them no less to the affections than to the intellect. This enunciation of foundation truths in eloquent and original language it is which makes his sermons lend themselves to quotation, and such extracts are no mere purple patches, the outcome of forced rhetorical display, but the natural and forcible expression of deep though often familiar truths. If we take for example his beautiful sermon on 'The Daily Self-Denial of Christ' we shall see that in it he deals with the great principle that 'virtue tried and triumphant ranks above innocence.' He touches on the mystery of the existence of evil in the world, how the springing of good out of evil disproves the Manichæan idea of two equal and opposing principles by setting the good above the evil, and then with great force he demonstrates how suffering tends to produce humbleness of mind, a disposition in which he finds the very

essence of Christianity and which is exemplified and raised to its highest power in Christ Himself.

'The cross,' he adds, 'is a large and comprehensive word, but with whatever variety applied to individuals, it cannot lose its essential nature; it still carries the nails that pierce the body and the shame that penetrates the soul. Wherever it rises upon the page of Scripture, it cannot but bring with it the shadow of pain and trouble; wherever it is planted, whatever be the celestial consolations, surely the daily world can no longer be the pleasant world it was of old. Wherever it is erected, surely, as at first, there will be "darkness over all the earth," even though that darkness may make the stars of heaven shine more brightly.'

A holiday visit to the Lake district in Westmorland which Archer Butler enjoyed in the summer of 1844 was counted by him as one of the greatest pleasures he had ever experienced. He explored the scenery of the lakes and joined in long walking expeditions with Sir W. R. Hamilton, the Irish Astronomer Royal, Archdeacon Hare, and Miss Arnold and Miss Maurice. His host, R. P. Graves, was in charge of the parish of Bowness, and lived in the rectory, not far from Rydal Mount, so that frequent visits were paid to Wordsworth, the philosophic poet, for whom the poetic philosopher shewed an ingenuous enthusiasm. A MS. poem, sent to his sister with the poet's autograph, idealizes the scene.

'Mightiest of all the laurelled lineage high,
He sate—as when in Fancy's golden gleam,
He saw deep visions by the sylvan Wye,
Or drew his childhood's bright Platonic dream.

'The brighter noontide hours in converse grave
And high had passed, with him our glorious guest,
Winander fondling still with playful wave
The faery barge that rocked her Poet's rest.

'He taught how men may rise to Soul through Sense,
Of that diviner vision which can see
Symbols in narrow Space of God's immense,
Shadows in Time of God's eternity.

'Of man—the sorrows humble souls endure,
The one great Heart that beats in all who move
O'er earth, the peaceful glories of the Poor
And all the meek sublime of human love . . .'

Mr. Graves states that

'Butler's fine enthusiasm and his companionable pleasantness made him the delight of the whole party. Many were the animated discussions which took place between these men, so powerful in intellect, so affluent in all the resources of knowledge, so brilliant in conversational eloquence and wit, so genial and unassuming in disposition and withal so constantly regardful of Christian principle in the exercise of their many gifts.'

On one occasion when one of the party stated that Byron shewed few signs of accurate observation of nature, and most present seemed to agree, Butler cited as an example to the contrary the image in the couplet—

'Yet, Freedom! yet thy banner, torn but flying,
Streams like the thunder-storm against the wind';

and Wordsworth assented, saying that he considered this to be the finest image in Byron's poetry, and, as displaying a grand ideal truth symbolized by an equally grand and correspondingly unusual phenomenon of the outer world, scarcely to be surpassed. The same witness also noted the simple earnestness with which the paramount importance of the truths of Christianity was upheld and enforced by a man possessed of so strong an intellect and such warm affections, and felt that this made his religious conversation deeply impressive; and the remarkable impressiveness of his preaching arose doubtless from the same cause. He twice occupied the pulpit in Bowness Church on the Sunday mornings, preaching from the texts, 'They crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh' (Heb. vi. 6), and, 'Behold, I am alive for evermore' (Rev. i. 18).

'Most striking' (Mr. Graves records) 'was the effect of the former sermon, in which he showed how the original crucifixion of our Lord was the natural result of the habitual feelings and practices of its guilty perpetrators, and that the very same corrupt feel-

ings and practices are constantly and habitually at work among ourselves, and under similar circumstances would produce a similar result. The power and truth of the analysis of human nature as now operating in the world around us, by which he sustained his argument, were really startling, and several of the congregation, struck by the lesson they had received, expressed to me their wish to subscribe towards the publication of the sermons of such a preacher.'

Both these sermons are contained in the first volume of his published sermons.[1] Butler, in a letter to his sister, records how on one of these Sundays he also preached in the evening at Ambleside Church,

'where there was a curious festival, a rural ornamenting of the church that takes place annually, some strange relic of old times. I brought a written sermon and had it actually on the cushion before me, and, suddenly struck by its being unsuitable to the congregation, substituted another text and preached from the occasion—a somewhat Irish feat of audacity!'

Of this discourse Mr. Graves relates that it was universally commended and admired.

About this time Butler defended Mr. Gladstone, who had been attacked in a Dublin paper by a correspondent who accused him of first holding 'the Pusey heresy' and then recanting. Butler shewed that the heresy and the recantation were alike imaginary. This brought him a grateful letter from Gladstone, in which, after expressing his thanks for the able statement thus made on his behalf, he goes on to speak of the growing difficulties of supporting the Irish Church,

'not only because the tone of thought in the region of politics was becoming more and more alien from the principle which sustained the Irish Church, but also because unhappily the clergy of that Church do not seem to grow as a body in the due appreciation of their own position, and I fear that in consequence they are gradually losing their hold over the clergy and most attached members of the Church of England. This, however, certainly ought to increase English sympathy towards you and those who think with you in Ireland.'

[1] Vol. I. pp. 49 *sqq.* 164 *sqq.*

In 1845 Newman published his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, and in the succeeding winter Archer Butler wrote a series of *Letters on Development* in answer to the essay. These were published in the Irish *Ecclesiastical Journal*, and immediately attracted attention. In a private letter (February 21, 1846) Butler says of Newman's work:

'It is very seductively written; indeed to confess the truth I was very nervous about taking it with me to the country at all; it is no trifle to be shut up in a lonely house to wrestle with such an athlete. However, I took courage as I got over the leaves; for with all its ability and attractiveness it is (as you may collect even from my criticisms) exposed at many points. The interest of the subject has drawn attention to the letters such as they are; I understand that W. Cantuar. and C. J. London. have been pleased to talk about them, an event which may remind you of the close of P. P.'s (Swift's hero's) account of the reputation of his views in Parliament! What you say of the Apostles' developments is very true; probably most of their teaching would be found involved in our Lord's brief deep sayings, and if Rome could prove that she really has a guidance as infallible as her own St. Peter had, we would, of course, bow before this authority of *her* developments too; but until she does, we have no recourse but of reason and logical conclusions. After all, the most satisfactory way to meet such a system as Newman's is to show what it might be made to lead to and thus drive it to ridiculous conclusions, which accordingly I do in the number now coming out.'

The Letters are nine in number, the first published in December 1845 and the last in November 1846. They were collected and edited, after Butler's death, by Thomas Woodward in 1850. Bishop Christopher Wordsworth had expressed an earnest wish that they should be circulated more extensively, and Bishop Thirlwall, as we saw, counted them the best of the many answers given to Newman's theory.

William Fitzgerald, afterwards Bishop of Killaloe, who was a pupil of Archer Butler and who succeeded him in the chair of Moral Philosophy, refers in his *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History* to these Letters. After speaking of Butler as 'a man whose genius will be long admired, not only in this University, whose fostering care he repaid by the

lustre which he flung around her name, but throughout the British Churches,' he contrasts him with his opponent in this controversy.

'Both were learned, both expert dialecticians, both masters of no vulgar rhetoric. But the causes in which these potent arms are wielded are not more different than the spirit which actuated the combatants. One heartily believing in the power of reason to elicit truth and faithfully applying that power to its discovery; the other avowedly sceptical upon this point, without faith in the efficacy of the instrument which he affects to use, choosing first the object of his belief, and then looking round for topics to vindicate that belief to the intellects of other men.'

The new theory was at first repudiated by some Romanist authorities, but it was afterwards adopted by many as a short and easy way of freeing the defenders of Romanism from a multitude of controversies on which the voice of antiquity was clearly against them. Butler calls the theory an intellectual romance. He shews how it can be applied to every form of Christianity actually existing, the Greek Church, the Anglican, and Protestantism, which are all developments. Therefore the additional assumption of Papal infallibility must be made; it can decide what is to be received and what rejected; but it is itself a development; and therefore the argument revolves in a circle. 'Thus mutually confronted the development and the infallibility hang their heads like two detected witnesses who appeal to each other for a character.' And in these circumstances the decision of a developing Church can only be provisional, because it may be set aside by the Church of the future. The Letters are full of acute reasoning and wit, and it is wonderful to think that they were composed in intervals snatched from the tasks of ministering to his flock, delivering his lectures in Dublin, and attending committee meetings to arrange for famine relief funds. This and the fact of their controversial nature may account for their plain and unadorned style, so different from that of his sermons and lectures. They constitute a remarkable proof of his powers of concentration and mental energy.

Butler was much in sympathy with the Catholic revival and followed its progress with deep interest. He felt, like many others, that the practical side of Christianity had been neglected in the teaching of the Evangelical party, and that the view of the Church in her corporate capacity had been to a great extent lost sight of. As early as 1837, just before his ordination, he wrote to Graves :

'I remember you were admiring Alexander Knox's writings when last we met; you have of course seen that two additional volumes have been published. I cannot but think that the tone of his views (though perhaps a little partial and exaggerated) is eminently calculated to do good at this time. Strong medicines are required for pressing cases, and, if he were more accurately equitable in his views of the two aspects of Christianity, he would not effect so much. No question of it he presses on the side where the balance has been lost—the side of practical sanctity.'

And again some years later (February 26, 1846) :

'Meantime the thing we want is the practical exhibition of real Catholic principles and institutions; it is the air of self-denial and deep devotion that they observe among the Romanists that is winning all these men over. So impressive is the beauty of their establishments for education that for my own part I confess I should be afraid to go much among them, and unfortunately (!) Romanism is witnessed in England in its best dress, meek, self-denying, profoundly devotional; while on the other side are arrayed the *Record*, Baptist Noel, and Exeter Hall! What wonder if men whose tastes have come to be formed in the ancient school should incline to the former? Oh that we had some thoroughly courageous and yet discreet bishop who would show what might be done when Anglicanism was taken out of the dead letter of the Prayer Book and translated into life and action!'

He was not blind, however, to the dangers involved in the wild utterances of Ward and some of the extreme party.

'I understand,' he writes (September 24, 1844), 'from an intelligent quarter there (England) that the ultra-Catholics are beginning to maintain that the Papal is really the Catholic Church in Ireland, and can fairly claim all the privileges of that

position. Curious if the Catholic revolution in England, after inflaming the Presbyterians against us here, should end by placing our necks under the heel of Rome! Have you read Ward's book? It is avowedly and undisguisedly Roman; indeed he treats as absolutely ludicrous the notion of comparing the two Churches; though at the same time stating that he never himself for an instant wavered as to the duty of continuing in communion with the English Church. Still he puts in strong and useful light the deficiency of our Church in the great business of individual spiritual direction, and probably the attention drawn to that point will eventuate in good, *e.g.* in the composition or compilation of books directed to that most momentous object in which, as you know, the Roman Church abounds, through its machinery of the confessional and the necessity of preparing its priests for that function.'

In his speech on Church education, delivered in Belfast in 1840, he insists first on the right of every living soul to have unrestricted access to the Scriptures, the fundamental documents of the Christian Faith, but he conjoins with this a second principle,

'the right of every soul baptized into the Church of Christ to receive those forms of doctrine, discipline and worship which that Church proposes to his acceptance as by her guarded and perpetuated from the days of Christ to the present hour. This stamps the Church of Ireland as Catholic in relation to that form of Protestantism which exaggerates and perverts the principles of liberty. This right of the Church is for her own children and assumes the possession by her of an ancient inheritance of systematic truth. Opening the Scripture to all and thus proclaiming the authority to which she bows, the test by which she wills to be tried, she yet with equal firmness maintains the truth of her own immemorial interpretation, the inherited forms and worship, and belief (as she asserts) of unanimous antiquity.'

It is for not one but both of these first principles of religious education for her sons that the Church of England has now to contend.

The autumn of 1846 brought with it the dreaded potato blight, and the whole district of Donegal felt the full force of it and seemed face to face with starvation. In his letters

Butler speaks of the tremendous problem of 'an overgrown population of paupers always on the edge of famine with but one plank—this pernicious potato—between them at all times and starvation, and this now suddenly disappearing.' He was himself incessantly occupied with the work of famine relief, and his own boundless generosity in the two years of scarcity is still remembered in the district. In some parts of Ireland the giving of relief was alleged to have been the occasion of attempts to proselytize, and a storm at once arose on the subject. Daniel O'Connell accused the Irish Society publicly of refusing relief to the starving poor unless they disobeyed their consciences and relinquished their faith. Butler and other clergy took up the cry and denounced such methods in the daily Press. They drew imaginary pictures of an odious system of religious tyranny.

'Famishing multitudes' (said Butler) 'are competitors for the means of existence. As brother men they gather to our doors imploring aid. The voice is feeble with exhaustion, or the voice gives way to that gloomy silence of hopelessness so fearfully familiar to us now, and we gently suggest to the despairing father the Bible without note or comment; we hold forth food, but he must reach for it through the iron grating of the Thirty-nine Articles! We set his hunger against his creed!'

The Society replied that its rules forbade the readers to force the Scriptures on the attention of any who did not wish to hear them.

Butler, in his letter to the Dublin *Evening Mail*, noted that the terrible visitation of famine did much to draw all classes and creeds together. He would leave great revolutions in religion to Providence, content in the meantime to observe how one principle at least shone out in its old immutable brightness, how that great law of love which our Divine Founder made the main characteristic of His religion still even in the most adverse circumstances exercised its inherent tendency to unite. He hinted also at the risk incurred in disturbing the habitual convictions of any sincerely religious man. It may sometimes be a duty to do so, but not unless immense care be taken to replace those

convictions with others as effective over the heart and life. Low, mixed, or uncertain motives to righteousness are better than none.

For some time before his death Archer Butler had been engaged in studying the subject of Faith and collecting materials for a work upon it. Some finished and a great mass of unfinished materials for this exist among his papers. He was deeply dissatisfied with the views of Bishop O'Brien upon the subject. Writing to Graves of Ward's *Ideal of a Christian Church,* he says: 'The middle part of the book is taken up with a fierce onslaught on Bishop O'Brien's views on faith, which may produce an interesting controversy. Do you remember our colloquy with Archdeacon Hare on the subject? Ward's objections are not wholly dissimilar, but urged with savage fury.'

O'Brien relied almost entirely on faith as trust, an emotion directed towards a Person. He contrasts 'believing the truths contained in the Word of God' with 'that trust or confidence which such belief ought to produce,' and says that the latter alone is the faith mentioned in the New Testament. Butler denies this: 'trust or faith,' he says, 'is not a *separate act subsequent to the belief of anything affirmed in Scripture,*' and this is so whether we contemplate that trust (or faith) as an intellectual act, or an emotion, or as a combination of both. It is the desiring intelligence and belief of what actually is in sacred Scripture. He wishes to bring out more clearly the intellectual element of faith.

'It seems to me that such *trust* is itself habitual belief of certain truths contained in the Word of God, viz. those that affirm the mercifulness of God in Christ to all who humbly seek Him, in which of course is necessarily involved His mercifulness to *me,* humbly seeking Him.'

'For it is not as though I believed Him merciful to all and thence inferred His mercy to me; in believing Him merciful to all I directly affirm His mercy to me and all others. My fulness of personal trust is only my dwelling upon part of the message set forth in Scripture, addressed as it is to me and to all. It is therefore direct belief of a Scriptural truth so far as it is a well grounded trust. So far as trust or confidence is an intellectual

act, so far it is the belief of my part in certain Scriptural affirmations which were really intended to include me as well as all others, in which I (so and so qualified) am constructively *named*. This identifies the object of faith with the Word of God, an important point; and thus rightly limits the trust to the revelation itself, and so checks all tendency to presumption—while at the same time it raises faith out of the position of a mere emotion, as trust or confidence is so often classed, for if faith be not peculiarly intellectual, what grace will remain to sanctify the understanding?'

O'Brien's view is still held by many. It may be found stated in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*,[1] where Professor Warfield of Princeton, represents faith as a vague 'reliance on God' rather than belief in His promises or covenant, revealed to us in Scripture and sealed to us in Sacraments. He speaks of this as an emotion rather than as intellectual assent, as though the reliance did not arise out of the conviction or belief, his own instance (Gen. xv. 6) being a striking case of belief in a revealed statement rather than the vague reliance on God Himself which he makes it. Faith is no mysterious gift laid we know not how in the lap of the souls of some men only and 'not grounded in the heart's own potencies,' but it includes a belief of the definite truths which are matters of revelation, and it *originates* in the acceptance of these truths by the understanding and the heart; thus faith, as Butler contends, must carry with it the idea of (1) fixed habitual belief, for it is belief of a character, which is something permanent, also (2) practical belief, for it implies that we feel a personal interest in the matter of the belief and appropriate the benefit to ourselves.

At the same time Butler does not overlook the difference in practical bearing between faith as an habitual conviction of truths and faith as an habitual reliance on a Person (though the latter can no doubt be resolved into habitual belief of truths relative to the Person).

'There is something peculiar in affection to a person quite distinct from belief of impersonal truths. This indeed seems rooted in the social nature of man. Our affections gather round

[1] *Op. cit.* vol. i. Art. 'Faith.'

the voluntary personal centre of good to us. To believe that a certain good is to redound to us, and to believe that a certain person is the willing producer and means of the good, are very different. To the latter belong all the habitual emotions produced by the belief of a kind *will*.'

When on earth it was the main object of our Lord to produce the recognition in Him of those personal characteristics of divine power and benevolence which make up the Messianic character. This is what is meant by 'believing in Him' in St. John's Gospel.

'Every instance of belief which gained miraculous cures was really faith in His personal powers and goodness: that is, it was an inferior or inchoate form—more or less advancing to complete enlightenment—of the great general belief of His Messiahship. In many—perhaps most—cases He brought about the belief of His Messiahship through the ordinary channel of assertion backed by miraculous proof; in the cases of miraculous healings He made an equivalent supernatural impression on the recipient of His favour, and thus at once produced that state (for the purpose of perpetual exemplification) to which—in its general character—the others were to be gradually conducted. An influence above man was operative indeed in both; in the one case, however, working by the ordinary rational faculties; in the other more or less independently of them; which is just the difference between ordinary operations of the Holy Ghost and interior miracles.'

To the intellectual and emotional elements of faith here insisted on Westcott adds a third, volition.[1] When he was dying Butler expressed a wish that he had been permitted to live long enough to finish this work. His reading on the subject had been very wide, his views were somewhat eclectic, and it can be seen from the completed portions of the work that he would have brushed aside mere disputings about words and made a really valuable contribution to theology.

His death was tragic in its suddenness. He had gone to preach at an ordination at Dunboe, Co. Derry. Among those ordained on that occasion was the Rev. William

[1] See *The Historic Faith*, note 2, p. 174.

Alexander, now Primate of Ireland, who has given an account of Butler's sermon. He mentions that the preacher briefly characterized each of the great Anglican theologians whose writings he recommended his younger brethren to read. This he did in sentences *so startlingly beautiful* as almost *to take away the breath* of the listeners. On his return he caught a chill, which issued in typhus fever, and he passed away on July 5, 1847, at the early age of thirty-five. His death was universally lamented. By his learning, his logical power, and his natural force of intellect he seemed fitted to take a place among the leaders of religious thought of his time. All accounts of him agree as to his wonderfully attractive disposition and his charm of manner, his frank and joyful temperament, 'the indescribable charm of his conversation,' and his marvellous felicity of language; again, his freedom from the faults which beset the literary character, for he was absolutely free from envy or assumption. It struck his contemporaries that he possessed that essential characteristic of genius, the principle of progress; his mind was both versatile and original and he was unwearied in the acquisition of knowledge. It is difficult therefore to say what he might not have attained to had he lived.

He was buried in his own quiet country churchyard, a crowd of several thousands being present, whose 'burst of grief' was but a type of the wider sorrow of the Church which mourned for him as one of the most gifted of her sons.

Art. IV.—EVOLUTION AND MORALITY.

1. *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas.* By E. Westermarck. Volume I. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1906.)
2. *Morals in Evolution.* By L. T. Hobhouse. Two Volumes. (London: Chapman & Hall, 1906.)

Dr. Westermarck's *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* is a work on the Science of Ethics. As such, it has for its object, he tells us, not to establish rules for moral conduct,

but to study the moral consciousness as a fact[1]; and fo the purpose of such a study it is not necessary to consider what validity such rules have, or indeed whether they have any. The case is, we suppose, the same with the Science of Ethics as it is with the Science of Religion: students of the latter science may study the origin and development of any form, or all forms, of religion without basing their researches and arguments on the assumption either that religion, in any of its forms, is true, or is not true. Whether religion is true is a question which cannot be settled by the Science of Religion; and in the same way the Science of Ethics cannot settle, and need not inquire, whether the rules for moral conduct which it studies have or have not any validity. Of course, we all have an opinion on such fundamental questions as these; and, with regard to ethics, Dr. Westermarck's opinion is that 'there are no general moral truths.' Different men, or societies of men, think and feel that they ought to act in certain ways—and that is all we can say. We cannot say, as a general moral truth, that in given circumstances every man ought to act or feel in a certain way. It is therefore interesting to observe that according to Dr. Westermarck men actually do say what in his opinion they should not say—viz. that every man ought to do and feel certain things. 'Society is the school' in which they learn to say this. 'The headmaster is Custom and the lessons are the same for all. The first moral judgments were pronounced by public opinion,'[2] and the lesson was that every boy in the school ought to act and feel in a certain way: that there were certain moral truths which were true for everybody. Private judgement in this stage did not exist, as Dr. Westermarck admits when he says 'the original form of the moral consciousness cannot have been the individual's own conscience.'[3] If we inquire, then, as to the origin of the moral emotions, Dr. Westermarck's reply is: 'Society is the birthplace of the moral consciousness; the first moral judgments expressed, not the private emotions of isolated individuals, but emotions which were

[1] *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, p. 18.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 9.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 123.

felt by the society at large; tribal custom was the earliest rule of duty.'[1] Transgression of the custom of the tribe or society calls forth public indignation; and as a member of the society 'I implicitly admit that the custom is equally binding for me and for you and for all the other members of the society.'[2] Further, as the moral emotions were in their origin emotions felt by society at large, so they are through all their development to the end: 'the moral emotions remain to the last public emotions—if not in reality, then as an ideal.' However, this development or evolution of the moral ideas 'is in no small degree effected by the efforts made by high-minded individuals to raise public opinion to their own standard of right.'[3] Not only are such individuals 'high-minded,' but they have a standard which, we infer, is really higher than public opinion, inasmuch as they succeed, or may succeed, in 'raising' public opinion to it. In those circumstances, then, we may remark, we have no difficulty in understanding that there is such a thing as moral progress, as Dr. Westermarck says there is: as will be seen, the evolution of the moral consciousness involves a progress in impartiality and justice.'[4] The reason presumably of the possibility of moral progress is that, while there are what Dr. Westermarck calls in chapter viii. enlightened moral judgements, there are, or have been, other judgements less enlightened: some persons have 'a higher morality, a moral standard more purified by reflection and impartiality' than others have.

Thus, it would seem, according to Dr. Westermarck, that private judgement on matters of morals is both the source of moral progress and the final court of appeal in such matters. Now this at least appears to be inconsistent with his other view that at the beginning private judgement did not exist, and that to the end moral emotions are not private but public, ideally if not actually. Yet, inconsistent or not, it seems to be deliberate. From the point of view that private judgement is the start and finish in the development of moral ideas, Dr. Westermarck says: 'My moral judgments are my own judgments; they spring from

[1] *Ibid.* p. 117 *sq.* [2] *Ibid.* p. 120. [3] *Ibid.* p. 123. [4] *Ibid.* p. 122.

my own moral consciousness ; they judge of the conduct of other men, not from their own point of view, but from mine,'[1] and, springing, as it does, on this view, from my own moral consciousness, 'the moral law commands obedience'—from me, of course, not from others, because, as we have seen, 'there are no general moral truths.' Not only are there no general moral truths in the sense that there are none which command obedience from man generally, but there are none which command obedience from me at all times, for Dr. Westermarck does not admit 'every man's conscience to be an infallible guide' ; and what commanded obedience from me at one time may not do so at another.

If we sort out the different opinions expressed by Dr. Westermarck, we find that there are three ; one is that the ultimate moral authority is society ; another is that the ultimate moral authority is the individual ; and the third is that there is no ultimate authority whatever. From the first of these three points of view, moral judgements express emotions felt by society at large ; and I recognize that they are binding for you, for me, and for all the other members of the society. This implies the statement, that I *ought* to feel them binding, to be a true statement. The second point of view appears to recognize—or perhaps to be necessitated by—the possibility of moral progress ; one individual may be 'higher-minded' than others and 'raise' them to his own level. But it is only effected by denying that moral judgements express emotions felt by society at large, and by asserting that, in pronouncing moral judgements, I judge the conduct of other men not from the point of view of society at large but from my own point of view. It is the judgements which spring from my own moral consciousness that are binding on me, and not those which spring from the emotions felt by society at large. The statement, then, that I ought to feel the moral judgements of society to be binding, is not a true statement. I may be higher-minded than others (in my own opinion). And others may be higher-minded (in their own opinion) than I. Thus we come to Dr. Westermarck's third point of view—viz. that

[1] *Ibid.* p. 19.

there is no ultimate moral authority whatever. Neither in society nor in the individual do we find ultimate authority—any means of deciding absolutely whether my opinion or the opinion of others is the higher. And the philosophical reason for this, according to Dr. Westermarck's philosophy, is that general moral truths or moral principles 'owing to their very nature, can never be true.'[1] 'The ultimate reason for this is, that the moral concepts are based upon emotions, and that the contents of an emotion fall entirely outside the category of truth.'[2] Moral truths, then, are moral concepts; moral concepts are emotions; and emotions cannot be said in any intelligible sense to be either true or untrue. Therefore, according to Dr. Westermarck, the statement that I ought to do what society feels to be right (or the statement that I ought to do what I feel to be right) is a statement which is neither true nor false, but meaningless.

This conclusion (that it is meaningless to say I *ought* to do what is felt, whether by me or by society, to be right) is of no value either from the point of view of philosophy or of common sense. Its only interest is that it reveals the fallacy by which Dr. Westermarck is misled. A truth is not a concept: a truth is, and a concept is not, a proposition. A concept has meaning only as part of a proposition. The concept of duty is meaningless except as the subject or predicate of a proposition. To say that, therefore, as subject or predicate it is meaningless is absurd. On the other hand, it may be said that an emotion is felt, whether any proposition is made about it or not: an emotion is a feeling, and a feeling is felt, proposition or no proposition. But approval and disapproval are judgements, whatever more or whatever else they may be. Approval is possible only if there is some one who approves and something of which he approves: approval is a judgement, and a judgement is a proposition. When, then, Dr. Westermarck says: 'Moral emotions are of two kinds: disapproval and approval,'[3] and bases his inquiries into 'the nature of the moral emotions' on that statement, he commits himself to

[1] *Ibid.* p. 18. [2] *Ibid.* p. 17. [3] *Ibid.* p. 21.

implying either that moral emotions are judgements or else that moral approval and disapproval are not judgements and are not propositional. And it is on this ambiguity that his argument proceeds. When it is necessary to argue that the sense of duty or 'ought' has no validity and no objectivity, it is reduced to an emotion or feeling or concept which is not a proposition or a judgement, and which is, therefore, meaningless. And then we are told that 'there are no general moral truths.' When, on the other hand, the argument requires that there should be moral progress, then moral emotions are pronounced to be judgements, and progress is explained to be due to 'enlightened moral judgements.'

We will now take the point of view that there are moral judgements, whether enlightened or unenlightened; that they have a meaning; and that they carry, or are felt to carry, authority. They have a history. That history may be a process of evolution. But when the evolution has been traced and the history recorded, there still remains the question: what authority, if any, have they? And we will consider the answer to that question, given by Mr. Hobhouse in his *Morals in Evolution*.

The 'good' for each man, according to Mr. Hobhouse, 'lies in the realization of what is in him, the development of his personality.'[1] Now, in each man there are qualities which, if realized, will be destructive of society; and there are also qualities which, if realized, will promote the growth and the good of society. The latter qualities constitute the 'social personality' of the individual; and that they should be developed and realized is for the common good. From the point of view of the common good, it is desirable that the individual and the society should each develop the other—that society should develop the social personality of the individual, and that the individual should promote the growth of society and the social good. Whether, however, it is equally desirable for the individual to develop only the social side of his personality, to sacrifice himself, perhaps to give up his life and put an end to 'the develop-

[1] *Morals in Evolution*, i. 70.

ment of his personality' altogether, is not a question which can be settled by the mere statement—however true—that it is desirable, in the interests of other people, that the individual should limit or extinguish himself in this way. 'What form of development is best for the individual,' Mr. Hobhouse says, 'is a question of the ultimate basis of morals.'[1] We will, therefore, go on to see what it is that Mr. Hobhouse presents as the ultimate basis of morality—only remarking at present that the sacrifice of the individual's life for the good of the community cannot be regarded as a 'form of development' for the individual, if death is for the individual a terminus beyond which there is no further existence and no further development in any form.

The question of the ultimate basis of morality is a philosophical question: it is 'the philosophical question of the nature of moral obligation, of moral authority, of the moral sanction.'[2] But though the question is one of philosophy, it is impossible to consider it without considering the nature and history of religious belief, or without considering the claim of religion that it provides the required authority and imposes the necessary obligation. Mr. Hobhouse, therefore, traces the evolution of religious belief in some detail so far as it affects men's views on the nature of moral obligation. 'The central fact of evolution,' he holds, 'is the slowly wrought out dominance of mind in things.'[3] 'The conditions of life'—originally if we understand Mr. Hobhouse aright, not under the dominance of any mind whatever—'come more and more under the dominion of Mind.'[4] This view is, of course, very different from 'a purely teleological doctrine of the world process,' for such a doctrine implies that the conditions of life, and of everything else, do not come more and more under the dominion of Mind, but are under it from the beginning, and to the end work under the conditions and for the end imposed by it. To this doctrine Mr. Hobhouse prefers the hypothesis of 'a spirit subject to conditions and achieving its full growth only by mastering them.' Naturally, there-

[1] *Morals in Evolution*, i. 70.
[2] *Ibid.* ii. 1.
[3] *Ibid.* ii. 284.
[4] *Ibid.* ii. 280.

fore, his examination of the nature and history of religious belief leads to the conclusion that the basis of moral authority and moral obligation is not to be found in the assumption or faith that there is a Spirit, a Mind, a God such as is the object of faith 'in the half-naïve creed of the churches.' [1]

But if the religions of the world are incapable of providing the moral authority and the moral sanction of which we are in search, fortunately there are 'ethical theories which arise independently of religion from reflection on the experience of human life,' [2] *e.g.* the ethics of Confucius and the doctrine of Mencius. Above all, there is the Platonic and the Aristotelian development of the Socratic doctrine of the true 'good' for the individual. Even still more important, for the development of a theory of morals independent of religion, is the growth of modern ethics which aim at shewing that morality is rational, and, as and because rational, possesses authority and constitutes an obligation. Mr. Hobhouse is too much of a philosopher to separate, as Dr. Westermarck does, thought from feeling; on the contrary, the rationality of morals means for him simply that morality is 'a coherent whole of thought and feeling,' and that as rational—and, therefore, obligatory—it determines 'the relation of each individual to the society of which he is a member.' [3]

Now, this conclusion that the value of the individual depends on his worth to society, that as a means to social ends he has value, and as an end in himself has none, is, from the point of view of society, satisfactory enough. But if we are to believe that what is required by the interests of society is the only thing which it is rational for the individual to aim at, we must have some reason for so believing. And thus far Mr. Hobhouse has given us no reason for believing that it is either obligatory or rational for the individual to be treated as having no interests of his own, and as being always a means and never himself an end. Still, we might be content not to insist pedantically on this; we might admit that it was reasonable enough for the individual to regard, or to try to regard, himself always as

[1] *Ibid.* ii. 284. [2] *Ibid.* ii. p. vi. [3] *Ibid.* ii. p. vi.

a means to the ends of society, if it were proved that the real, ultimate, interests of the individual simply could not be different from those of society. But Mr. Hobhouse admits that they are different at present: 'the harmony of individual happiness and social development is imperfect, and only approached by degrees as society improves.' [1] According to Mr. Hobhouse, in some, perhaps remote, future, there will be no gap between the good of the individual and the good of the society; but at present there is, and Mr. Hobhouse fails to shew that it is rational to make, or to expect or to accept, the sacrifice of the one to the other, so long as the gap exists.

Thus Mr. Hobhouse never satisfactorily answers the question of what is rational, what is morally and rationally obligatory, for the individual. He fails to shew that the good of the individual and of society harmonize in the life of individuals now living; he does not even claim to do more than argue that there is a tendency to such harmony. That tendency is only a tendency, not a necessity; for its realization constitutes progress, and progress, as Mr. Hobhouse admits, neither has been uninterrupted nor is inevitable. If it is to continue to make way, the individual, as a reasonable creature, must be convinced that it is rational for him to forego his own happiness or even to lay down his own life, in order to strengthen a tendency to a state of society which may never be realized, and of which, if it is ever realized on earth hereafter, he will certainly not be a member. Mr. Hobhouse produces no argument to shew that such action is either rational or obligatory on the individual. He merely makes, tacitly and quite unconsciously, the violent assumption that the individual, as in himself an end, is to count for nothing; that the relation of the individual to society is to be determined solely by the consideration of what is good for others—forgetting that he has himself held up as 'the ideal of conduct,' one to which man is called 'to conform simply because such conduct is best for himself and humanity.' [2]

Mr. Hobhouse fails all the way through to recognize

[1] *Ibid.* p. vii. [2] *Ibid.* ii. p. 161.

that the individual is an end quite as much as society is; and it is only so long as we fail to recognize this that it is possible to take evolution as a philosophy or as a substitute for philosophy. The end of evolution as a process, the result which it is finally to bring about, must come at the termination of the process. The stages which lead up to it, and all they contain or consist of, are but means to 'the harmony of individual happiness and social development.' That is the end of evolution, and individuals who live in any of the stages leading up to it are means to an end which they cannot enjoy. They are not themselves ends; they have no absolute value; their value is that of instruments, to be estimated according to their degree of utility in producing a state of things from which they are, on the terms of the hypothesis, excluded. The whole philosophical problem lies in discovering what is best for the individual as well as for the society to which he belongs—in harmonizing the good of the individual and the good of society. To adjourn the realization of that harmony, as Mr. Hobhouse does, to some remote stage of future society, is to admit that its realization, within the limits of the earthly life of individuals now existing, is impossible. It cannot, therefore, be rational for or obligatory on the individual. Neither is it obligatory on or rational for society in one century to sacrifice itself or to devote itself to forwarding the interests of some other society in some distant future. It was neither the duty nor the business of primitive man to make the earth a comfortable place of residence for us. He was himself an end and not merely a means to our comfort. Doubtless the plough that is now used has been gradually evolved from the digging-stick which he used. But his stick was meant by him for his own use, and not for evolution. The purpose for which he used it was the same as that for which the modern plough is used. The end subserved by the plough, in all stages of its evolution, has been the same for every generation that has used it. To say that it has been put through its evolution in order to produce the plough used by us, or some future improved plough to be used by our remote

successors, is obviously absurd; we use it for our own benefit, not for the sake of carrying on its evolution. It is equally absurd to argue that society is organized—still more absurd to say that society *ought* to be organized—not in order that each one of us may realize his end, but solely in order that some future generation may realize their end. Yet that is the absurd conclusion to which we are forced, if we commit the fallacy of assuming that the production of the modern plough—or of modern society—was the end with which the primitive digging-stick was used, or for which primitive society existed. The end or purpose of man is not something which can only be realized at the termination of the evolutionary process. It is not something which can be adequately realized within the limits of this earthly life, or in this world while the individual is still in it—still less when he is no longer in it.

We come back, then, to the question from which Mr. Hobhouse started: 'What form of development is best for the individual?' The answer we give to that question is crucial in deciding what we are to accept as the ultimate basis of morals. And Mr Hobhouse fails to prove that the conduct which he recommends for the individual is best for the individual. That is to say, he fails to solve the philosophic problem of morality.

The real, ultimate, interests of the individual must—we all feel—be identical with those of the society of which he is a member. The philosophic question is: What assumption is it which, being made, will make this belief rational, and, therefore, authoritative and obligatory? We must assume that the society cannot be one purely or solely of this world, and that the existence of the individual who is a member of such a society cannot be limited to this life. And the law of such a society can only be the love of God, in which and by which alone its being is.

F. B. Jevons.

Art. V.—THE THEOLOGY OF THE WISDOM LITERATURE.

1. *Encyclopædia Biblica.* Art. 'Wisdom Literature.' By C. H. Toy, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (London : A. & C. Black, 1903.)
2. *Job and Solomon : or the Wisdom of the Old Testament.* By T. K. Cheyne, D.D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture in the University of Oxford, &c., &c. (London : Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1887.)
3. *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*, being the Third Series of American Lectures on the History of Religions. By the same. (New York and London : Putnam, 1898.)
4. *The Theology of the Old Testament.* By the late A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, New College, Edinburgh. (Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark, 1904.)

We propose in this article to give some account of certain features in the theology of the Wisdom writers of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha, and afterwards to consider more generally the value of their contribution towards the development of religious thought. The interest of these writers has been increasingly recognized in recent years. Certainly the appeal of the Scriptures to human nature would be far less complete than it is had their various works not found a place either within or adjacent to the canon of Holy Writ. It is true that for the most part we must not reckon them as among the ranks of the constructive theologians. In the main their fundamental religious ideas are those of the Old Testament generally. The great data of religion are the same for the author of Job as for Isaiah of Babylon, for Koheleth as for the Deuteronomist. The central conceptions of prophecy were a part of their spiritual heritage, and it is within the well-defined limits of the religion of Israel that their activities of thought are conducted. In a more restricted sense, however, their

theology is their own. Their general attitude and point of view is distinctive and characteristic of the sages as a class. Their tone is not that of the prophet. Their interests are diverse from those of the lawgiver and of the priest. To this extent it is justifiable to treat their theology as separate. Within the national Church of Israel they are a school apart.

Three features in particular distinguish the Wisdom writers as a class. Of these the most obvious is their concern with 'Wisdom.' Take the term 'Hokmah' in its widest Biblical sense, and it is true to say that it is the subject-matter of which all these authors treat. It is a quality both human and divine. It is personal and impersonal. It is the creative and directing principle of the universe and it is also the shrewd cleverness which secures success. The noblest poetry is not too exalted for the panegyric of wisdom: it inspires also the tritest commonplaces of the market-place and the bazaar. In one or another of its manifold phases these writers all deal with wisdom, though in point of date, literary merit, and their general estimate of life they are widely separated. The problem of the Book of Job is a problem for wisdom. Koheleth had started out in quest of wisdom, and the son of Sirach had made her the object of his youthful prayers. For the typical sage she is the 'principal thing,' and it is round this central conception, so elastic, so suggestive, so peculiarly their own, that this interesting class of Old Testament writers allow their thoughts to range.

A second characteristic of these teachers is that they take the human and universal rather than the national and particularist point of view. They have been called the 'Humanists' of Israel. The 'wisdom' with which they are concerned is not the peculiar possession of their race: Egypt, Edom, and Tyre had Wisdom and Wise Men, though they had nothing equally comparable with the Prophets and the Law. Agur and Lemuel may have lived beyond the borders of Israel Job, like Balaam, was a non-Israelite, while both Koheleth and the son of Sirach have travelled and seen the world. The Wise Men care little for such

conceptions as the Covenant and the divine choice of Israel, which were everything to the Prophets. They possess in consequence less intensity of feeling, but they take a wider view of life. Their moral standard is less exacting, their sympathy with the varying phases of human experience is broader. All this has its close relation to their theology. It helps also to account for the fact that no portion of the Bible has such frequent parallelism of thought with the literature of other peoples as these books of wisdom. Their observations on the course of this world and on the ways of God find echoes in the works of all the Moralists. In one passage we are reminded of Lucretius ; in another of Carlyle.

There is a third observation to be made on the attitude of these writers. They write as students of life. Their starting-point is not revelation so much as experience. Their tone is more reflective than inspired. Some of the Prophets evidently disliked the Wise Men as a class, and their writings had to struggle for canonicity, not always successfully, against the influence of the legalists. Still, it is an unfair estimate of their purpose to regard them as the rivals or competitors of Prophecy and the Law. Rather they supplement the work of the Prophet and the Lawgiver. They have no visions and few great certainties. They announce no Day of the Lord, no Golden Age, no splendid restoration, no distant Messianic hope. They take human life as they see it. They take the principles of the religion of Israel as they have learned them. And to these they apply, within certain well-defined limits, their powers of observation and reflection. It is not their aim so much to enlarge the spiritual heritage of their race or to elevate the common standard of duty as to discover the principles which underlie the admitted facts of life, and by this discovery to assure themselves and their contemporaries of the truest and wisest attitude for man to adopt towards the world around him and the God above. This spirit of reflection has also its direct relation to the theology of these writers.

To what extent, it may be asked, is a right appreciation of the teaching of the Wisdom Books dependent upon the

settlement of questions of criticism and the closely allied questions of authorship and date? Professor Cheyne remarks [1] in connexion with the Book of Job that the necessity for a settlement of textual questions is generally recognized as an essential preliminary for any advance in exegesis. In illustration of this we may observe that the religious significance of the book is wholly altered according as we believe with Dr. A. B. Davidson that the Epilogue was part of the original book and that the author had this conclusion in his mind throughout; or as, on the other hand, we conclude on internal grounds that Job's restoration to prosperity is no integral part of the whole work as originally planned, but only 'a necessary concession to the unspiritual multitude'—in no sense, therefore, capable of furnishing a clue to the central religious conceptions of the author. And, to take a parallel example from the Book of Ecclesiastes, our view of its meaning will differ according as the last six verses are regarded as an addition of later orthodoxy, intended to redeem the book from its offence to piety; or as being, on the other hand, the author's own conclusion, designed to point by contrast the moral and warning of the other portions of his work which are so different in their tone. The value of these books would be raised, undoubtedly, could all such questions find definite settlement, just as their interest would be increased by our attainment of certainty as to the exact historical conditions under which they were composed. Whether the earliest gnomic collection in the Book of Proverbs really reflects the life of the Chosen People in the days of good king Jehoshaphat, whether the Book of Job is really a product of the Exile, whether the pessimism and despair of Koheleth are the outcome in an individual soul of the general hopelessness of the later Persian period, and what exactly were the conditions which made the son of Sirach so happily content with the world just as he found it—these all, no doubt, are questions we would gladly see answered on the ground of conclusive evidence. It is, however, quite impossible, in the present state of our knowledge, to give

[1] Art. 'Job,' *Encyc. Bib.*

definite answers to these questions of textual criticism or of historical environment. We fall back upon probabilities, and are grateful for a consensus of experts, wherever one is to be found. Imagination, too, must help us to some extent, as it does in the charming ideal biography prefixed by Dean Plumptre to his edition of Ecclesiastes. Moreover, it is one result of the universalistic standpoint of these writers, to which we have already referred, that the value of the teaching and content of any portion of the Wisdom Literature has a greater intrinsic security and is less affected by questions of date and criticism than is the case, for example, in regard of either the Pentateuch or the Prophetical Books. The meaning of the Book of Job remains much the same whatever view be adopted, on critical grounds, of the speeches of Elihu. The estimate we have formed of the teaching of the son of Sirach is only slightly affected by the discovery, so important on other grounds, of the Hebrew manuscripts.

Within the limits of a single article it will only be possible to point out a few of the chief characteristics of the Theology of the Wisdom Scriptures. For convenience' sake we propose to deal with these under four general heads : the Nature and Being of God ; the Divine Order in the World ; Last Things ; and, finally, Man in relation to God. The principal points of interest in these books—so far, that is, as their definitely religious ideas are concerned—will be found, we believe, to relate themselves naturally with one or another of these central conceptions.

I.

The assertion[1] that the Theology of the Wisdom Literature may claim some independence of other Biblical Theology does not at any rate hold good as regards its presentation of the nature of the Deity. In this respect it takes over the highest ideas of Prophecy and betrays no anxiety to provide itself with other fundamentals. Like other Hebrew teachers the Wise Men never attempt to give any proof of

[1] Duhm, *Theologie der Propheten*, p. 4.

the existence of God, nor even to explore the reasons for this cardinal assumption. The Theism of the Proverbs may be cold and colourless, but it is unquestioning and it is consistent. No scepticism in the canonical writings is so audacious as that of Job or so profound as that of Koheleth. Yet both hold that God exists, and this not so much by an effort of faith as because doubt on this point never crosses their minds. For the one, 'God liveth' is the supreme certainty; for the other, 'God is in heaven and thou upon earth' are equally ultimate facts. Moreover, the Theism of these writers is definitely monotheistic. They represent here a later stage of religious thought than the Prophets. Hosea, Isaiah, and even the prophets of the Exile protest that the gods of the heathen are vain and non-existent in the tone of teachers who know that their assertions will be denied. But the Wisdom writers have nothing to say about 'other gods.' There is no need for them to make protests against idolatry. The author of the Book of Wisdom does indeed refer to the idols of Egypt, but not so much to convince his readers of their unreality as to express his contempt for their devotees. By the purity of their monotheism many of these teachers are wholly delivered from the limitations of ethnic religion and particularistic views, while even such less advanced sages as the son of Sirach never revert to the position that Jehovah is so peculiarly the God of Israel that what is not of Israel does not belong to Him. The practice of these writers in regard to the different names for God is in this respect instructive. The distinctively national name 'Jehovah' is used in the Book of Job only in the Prologue and the Epilogue. In Ecclesiastes it is never used at all. It was more natural to these writers to use such terms as 'Elohim,' which suggested no peculiar relations between God and Israel. And while the Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus do, it is true, make frequent use of the term Jehovah, they never press its nationalistic limitations. These, indeed, it had largely lost by the close of the Captivity, and the Jehovah 'whose eyes were in every place,' and of whom it could be said that 'man's spirit was his lamp,' is clearly not on the same

plane as Chemosh and Milcom, but is none other than the universal God. In a similar tendency these writers abandon anthropomorphic conceptions. It is true that the Prologue to Job brings us into the court of an almost earthly potentate, and that the poem closes with what is called a theophany. But it was surely a spiritual theophany. Job hardly saw, like Moses, any outward form or shape, and 'mine eye seeth thee' must relate to inward vision. Apart from this, if it be an exception, the Wisdom Literature has no theophanies and it has no miracles. The God of Ecclesiastes is without passions or emotions. The God of the Proverbs rules by general laws without favour and without caprice. These writers have moved some way from the prophetic and narrative books in regarding the Deity as less immediately related to man and to the world. Their conception of God does not cease to be 'economic,' but the Divine Being is raised somewhat further from the details and management of the economy. Their thought has gone some little way in the direction of Transcendence. It is a necessary consequence of this that, while the Wisdom writers have helped to spiritualize the idea of God and to rid it of Israelite limitations, their Divine Being tends inevitably to be somewhat more remote than the God of the Prophets. On the whole He is further from life, and less 'interested,' if the term may be allowed, in the affairs of His servants, than either the God of the second Isaiah or the tender and ever present Deity of the Psalmists. There is less emotion, less enthusiasm in their attitude towards Him in consequence. More is said of the 'fear of the Lord': 'Be thou in the fear of the Lord all the day long'; 'God is in heaven, and thou upon earth: therefore let thy words be few.' These counsels are typical of the Sages' Religion. There is real reverence, but little sense of communion. Their Deity tends to be remote, dispassionate, and even cold, and in view of these characteristics it is important to ask whether He is also a God of Moral Character and a God of Love.

In regard to the first of these two qualities the affirmative answer can be given without hesitation. He favours

certain persons for their moral excellence: He dislikes certain courses of action for opposite reasons. Job is confident that, could he but find God, 'the upright might reason with Him.' Even though He have made some things crooked, Koheleth believes Him to be a God of judgement, and this implies a moral nature. His order is a righteous order because in His own Nature He is righteous. Thus even the Sceptical Books never deny that God is a God of moral character, while the other portions of this literature frequently assert it. If God had once been admitted to be a God without moral characteristics, the problem of Job would have been no problem in the real sense of the term at all.

God's Omnipotence, then, for the Wisdom writers, is qualified by His righteousness: it is a further question whether His righteousness is qualified by love. For many of the highest teachers of the Old Testament this is an unquestioned doctrine. Hosea, Isaiah of Babylon, and the Psalmists tell of 'mercy and judgement' without ever finding the two elements incompatible. And, generally speaking, this is also true as regards the non-canonical Wisdom Books, Ecclesiasticus and the Wisdom of Solomon. The son of Sirach regards God as 'full of compassion and mercy': he uses the figure of the good 'shepherd'; he speaks in the last chapter of his book from personal experience. So in the Book of Wisdom God is the saviour of all: His 'friendship' is open to all, to which we may add the beautiful saying, 'even if we sin, we are thine.'[1] But in the case of the Canonical Books the question is more difficult. In the Book of Proverbs the word 'Love' is only once used of God. The emotional element in Religion, together with that element in the Divine Nature to which human emotion is the response, remains unemphasized and in abeyance. But what of Job and Ecclesiastes? Is there any love in the Divinity these two books recognize? In Job the blessings of the Epilogue do not touch the view of the Deity in the poem itself. Dr. Cheyne quotes[2] the words of the Jewish scholar Luzzatto: 'The God of Job is

[1] Wisdom xv. 2. [2] *Job and Solomon*, p. 104.

not the God of Israel, the gracious one : He is the Almighty and the Righteous, but not the Kind and Faithful one.' To this, however, he dissents, since 'the God of Job would be less than infinitely righteous if He were not also kind.' Delitzsch and Ewald agree in this, and Professor A. B. Davidson's interpretation of the book tends in the same direction. This is the most that can be said for the doctrine of a divine love in Job : the book, it must be remembered, deals mainly with the question of God's justice which had been so fiercely disputed. Koheleth, however, knows nothing of the love of God. His view is so much calmer, more deliberate and more permanent than that of Job, that we are compelled to recognize in this writer a complete scepticism, if not an implied denial, on the point. In his view God orders all, gives all, sees all : He may be offended or be pleased : the surest wisdom is to fear Him. But there is no hint of any more intimate relationship between the human and the divine.

II.

Biblical Theology is little inclined to speculate upon the nature and attributes of the Deity in His own absolute and unrelated existence, and prefers rather to consider His self-revelation in the various phases of the order of the world. What God has done is in this way for all Hebrew religious philosophy the index to what God is. The Wisdom writers are among the poets of the Bible, and they have the poet's eye and the poet's thought for the beauty and the majesty of the world of Nature. It has been well said that they belong to the class of 'those poet-theologians from whom we English have learned so much.' Now, these writers recognize an order in Nature. They do not, indeed, realize the minute exactitude and the rigid sequence of natural laws after the manner of modern science. But their grasp of the truth is sufficiently strong for them to discern in Nature a revelation of the Divine will. And they know no distinction between natural and revealed religion, for this best of reasons—that Nature is a revelation.

It has been argued that Greece found the divine in what is harmonious and lucid: Hebraism in what is monstrous and obscure.[1] But the antithesis may easily be pressed too far. The fixed boundaries of the deep, the appointed ordinances of the heavens, the regularity of the processes of Nature, the determining influence of creative wisdom in the cosmogony of the Proverbs, are all instances of the early conceptions of a cosmic order. Ecclesiastes even, though he knows nothing of any 'increasing purpose' and directly denies development, still discovers fixed principles in the physical world. Everything has its season and its time. The winds and the rivers have their appointed circuits. The universe has no progress, no evolution: it is a series of cycles. But it is not chance, it is not chaos—it is the work of God who doeth all. And other writers bear out this idea. The forces of Nature discharge their tasks in ceaseless obedience to the Divine will; each element has its ordained use; all things 'consist' by the Word of God, and at the basis of phenomena is a conscious Power which holds all things together. Occasionally there emerges the further suggestion of certain moral affinities in Nature. Some winds are created for vengeance: fire and hail, tooth of beast and adder's fang are instruments for the destruction of the ungodly. History affords evidence of the sympathy of the universe with righteousness.[2]

This frank claim that the natural world is a factor in the moral and spiritual processes of Divine Government should be compared with the teaching of the Prophets as to the regeneration of Nature for which they look in the Messianic Age, and with St. Paul's wonderful account of the spiritual purpose and tendency of Nature in the Epistle to the Romans.

Probably the most interesting part of the Wisdom Theology is that which deals with the Divine Order in its relation to the moral life of Man. It was the established doctrine that the Judge of all the Earth must do right, and

[1] Renan, *Livre de Job*, p. lxxvi.

[2] Wisdom xvi. 17. 'For the Cosmos is a fighter for the righteous. The passage is a notable one.

that man can know the righteousness of His doings. This amounted to the belief that it was of the very essence of God's government that He should reward righteousness and punish its opposite. The prosperity of those who pleased Him, and, its obvious correlative, the sufferings of those who did not, thus became a truth for which all devout and orthodox Israelites expected, at least in pre-exilic days, to find indisputable evidence in the facts of life. So long as the nation remained the spiritual unit, this was never an impossible belief. The prosperity that was the reward of national righteousness would come at a later day, if it did not come at once. It was promised to Israel, not to particular Israelites. Conversely, the sins for which the fathers did not suffer themselves would be visited upon their children. Now, this theory of a moral order which completely realized itself in this world was transferred from the nation as a whole to the individual so soon as the downfall of the State, and, still more, the evident moral distinctions within it, made the community no longer the most natural unit for the purposes of religious thought. Within the range of a single life's experience God's order must be manifest : the good man must gain by his goodness, the bad man suffer for his wrong. This was orthodoxy, and the orthodox demanded without hesitation that the facts of life should accord with the theory. Nothing is more surprising in the religious thought of the Bible than the pertinacity with which this belief held its ground. It is accepted without question in the Proverbs : Job's three friends assert it from their several standpoints : Koheleth is convinced of its truth, though he has seen exceptions to it. The son of Sirach gives it an entire adherence. It survived, as we know, till the days of the Gospel : a massacre of Galilean pilgrims or the fall of a tower in Siloam was held to be evidence of the sinfulness of those who thereby lost their lives.[1] This doctrine of a moral order in the world, visible as regards the individual within the limits of a single life's duration, was held by all the orthodox sages throughout the whole of the reflective period of Jewish

[1] Cf. also St. John ix. 1, 2.

thought. It was asserted with robust faith and survived an abundance of contrary instances.

There were some, however, who realized the inherent difficulties of the doctrine. The Psalmists and Jeremiah were greatly perplexed by the prosperity of the wicked. The common solution was to affirm that such prosperity was shortlived, or, when this proved inadequate, to hazard the further theory that the penalty came in the next generation. This, of course, on any individualistic assumptions, ceased to justify the ways of God at all. There is a fine and legitimate contempt in the words with which Job dismisses this retrospective righteousness.[1] The difficulty was really untouched by either of these insufficient explanations. And the central interest of the Book of Job, itself the central and most important book of all the Wisdom Literature, is this difficulty of Faith. Job is a righteous man; yet Job is visited with an unusual severity of suffering. The hero does not claim that he is sinless. He is ready to admit that in the common frailty of human nature he has had faults and iniquities which need the Divine pardon. But he is conscious of no exceptional wickedness, and in language more bold and passionate than any other speaker in the Bible ever uses towards God, he asserts that his sufferings are wholly out of proportion to his deserts. The hero's part in the poem is thus a sustained arraignment of the Divine justice. His well-meaning, orthodox, yet inadequate comforters can only apply the recognized solution to his particular case, and assert that his sufferings must be evidence of exceptional sin. These are the two theological positions of the central part of the book. The antithesis between the two grows more and more defined at each fresh stage of the controversy. At the end we are left with the traditional and the sceptical positions, one over against the other in fully developed antagonism, no single effective approach towards reconciliation having been made on either side. At length the Almighty answers Job out

[1] 'Ye say, God layeth up his (*sc.* the wicked man's) iniquity for his children.
Let Him recompense it unto himself, that he may know it.'—xxi. 19.

of the whirlwind, but in the full sense of the term He does not answer His servant at all. The argument of these cc. xxxviii.–xli., singularly beautiful as they are from a literary point of view, is only that man must accept moral mysteries, as he accepts mysteries in Nature, and must not seek to understand. Job is silenced and submits. He has not seen the answer to his problem, he has only seen that God's ways are too vast for man to comprehend. The question, therefore, is left unsolved. At the close of the poem we are without any clear and sufficient light upon the central difficulty of its thought. The book raises a problem to which it finds no effective answer, though this interpretation of it is quite consistent with the admissions that Job never wholly loses his faith, that his sufferings are meant to test his righteousness, that they have an educative value, that the book has, secondarily, a national significance, and that in the Epilogue the orthodox position is reasserted, and the hero compensated by flocks and children and rings of gold. All these subsidiary lines of interpretation leave the central problem of the poem still without any complete solution.

The Book of Job must, however, be estimated not on the basis of its permanent and positive theological teaching, but in relation to the development of Hebrew religious philosophy. So regarded, its result is a negative one, but it is difficult to exaggerate the importance of its negation as a preliminary to the reception of a wider and higher truth. The sufferings of the righteous man remain at the end of the book unexplained : Job's friends have retired : Job is silent : the Almighty has only asserted that other things also are inexplicable. But the traditional theory has, at any rate, been discredited. It is inadequate to the task of presenting the world as a moral order. Even though the duration of the individual life be doubled, there is not space within these temporal limits for the dispensations of the Eternal Providence to manifest their inherent righteousness and to make their ultimate purpose for the individual spirit clear.

This necessity for enlarging the area of the domain within which the solution of the problem may be sought

has been frequently recognized. The opinions of one or two well-known interpreters of the Book of Job may be quoted with advantage. Delitzsch terms it 'an inadequate theodicy.' Ewald asserts that 'the thought of the book has no validity whatever, if it cannot find the basis of its certainty in the immortality of the soul.' Professor Davidson, who lays less stress on the book's insufficiencies, still admits that 'no solution of Job's problem is vouchsafed,' and that 'Job's results, as given in the body of the book, are wholly negative.' And Renan's words with regard to another book of the Wisdom Literature apply in principle to Job : 'Il est clair que les impénétrables obscurités dont le gouvernement du monde est entouré aux yeux de notre auteur seraient dissipées si Cohelet avait la moindre notion d'une vie à venir.' Are there, then, any hints in Job and the other books of this literature of the 'larger hope' in the light of which the contradictions of human experience in this world shall be at any rate not final? This brings us to a new division of our subject—the position of the writers as regards the 'Last Things.'

III.

In matters of Eschatology the authors of the Wisdom Literature take in the main the same standpoint as the Old Testament generally. Death is never annihilation : it is the passage of the human personality from one state of existence to another—with death man only ceases to be in the sense that he ceases to have any part or lot in the life of the world. The dead are 'gathered unto their own people,' they 'go hence,' 'they go the way of all the earth.' The place of their after-existence is Sheol, the dim hollow underworld, the meeting-place of all the departed, where life is robbed of all that gives it colour and meaning and value in this present world. It is a land of forgetfulness, with no moral distinctions and no relics of human interest, where the soul is even deprived of all fellowship with God. Is this view ever modified in the Wisdom Books? Do their authors ever hint at

or teach any other view of the life beyond? Does anything worth calling Immortality ever come within their scope?

In attempting to give the outlines of the answer to this question the several books must be considered separately. The Proverbs, more concerned as they are with this life than with any unseen future, shew that the collectors of gnomic wisdom did not, as a rule, feel any occasion to question current doctrine in regard to the end of life. Sheol is the 'pit,' swallowing up the lives of men, insatiable in its capacities, vast in its dim recesses which are only penetrable to the eyes of God. This is the common Old Testament view. But possibly even here there are exceptions. It is said of the strange woman that 'her quests are in the depths of Sheol.' When the several passages bearing on this subject are put together, they appear to imply more than that the immoral man finds his way to Sheol more quickly than the man of virtue. Some relation of consequence seems to be suggested between man's condition in Sheol and Sin. There may be here an early phase of the doctrine of Future Retribution, a suggestion—no more—that men meet in the other world with the consequences of their deeds in this. Conversely, even though Proverbs xv. 24 and xxiii. 14 express nothing more than current ideas, the saying that 'the righteous hath hope in his death' is admitted by Professor Toy[1]—a commentator not predisposed to discover the New Testament in the Old—to be a clear reference to Immortality, unless the reading is erroneous. Koheleth has little to add on the side of Hope. He reasserts the current view—there is 'one event,' 'one place' for all. He admits, however, the wider possibility when he asks 'Who knoweth the spirit of man whether it goeth upward?' and almost asserts it in saying 'The spirit shall return unto God who gave it.' Here and there, too, are words which may suggest a Future Retribution. His outlook is sceptical, cynical, but at least not indifferent. The son of Sirach has been recognized as an exponent of incipient Sadduceeism. His normal view of the 'Last Things' is to be found in such words as these: 'The son of man is not immortal'; 'the covenant

[1] *Commentary on Proverbs xiv. 32.*

of the grave is not shewed to thee' ; there is no 'inquisition of life' there, 'no luxury,' no praise of the Most High. The only hereafter a man can hope for is in the recollection of later generations, and the well-known chapters in praise of famous men gain significance when we remember the writer's standpoint. The exceptions, if any, to this general teaching are rare. But he does make reference to Enoch's translation. He accepts the tradition which credited Samuel and Elijah with a continued agency in this world after death. He does not omit the story of Elijah raising a dead man, and alike for the Judges and the twelve Prophets he prays that 'their bones may flourish out of their place.' The strange words, 'we also shall surely live,' would be most important if the text were not very doubtful.

There are two important passages in the Book of Job which are as momentary and passing gleams of brighter and wider hopes. They do not afford Job any solution for his problem, because he can only regard them as ideas of glorious significance but without any reliable guarantee. Of these the one is chapter xiv. 10–15.

> 'All the days of my warfare would I wait
> Till my release should come.
> Thou shouldest call and I would answer thee:
> Thou wouldest have a desire to the work of thine hands.

He has contemplated the possibility of man being aroused out of the sleep-life of Sheol. But he repudiates the conception: he dare not believe it. Then he passes on to express, in the language of a prayer which does not expect to be fulfilled, his longing that this might have been true, and that to his own question 'If a man die shall he live again?' the affirmative answer had been possible. A religious conception must be clearly grasped before it can be definitely denied. Job is lingering over a hope too good to be true, but it is important to observe how clearly the essentials of the doctrine of Immortality are present to his mind. Here is the sleep of an intermediate state: here is a rising or waking from the grave: here, too, is the most indispensable of all the elements in the wider hope, the

thought of an ultimate reunion of the personal soul with God. The sufferer falls back upon his sorrows, but he has seen the further country, though himself, indeed, he may not enter in. The other passage is the well-known one beginning

'I know that my redeemer (vindicator) liveth.'[1]

So much has been said about these difficult, disputed, and yet splendid words that we only propose to point out again how, according to their most commonly accepted interpretation, the mind of Job is led on from the prayer for an inscription that should attest his innocence after his death, to the conviction that God, as his Vindicator, shall indeed accomplish this great acquittal for him, and then, since his deliverance would be incomplete if he did not know it himself, to the further thought of his own personal share in this ultimate justification. Of these words of daring hopefulness Professor Davidson writes : 'I do not know but that to Job's mind all the religious essentials were present which we associate with the future life.'[2] The author of the poem did not venture to develop his own suggestion. But once, at any rate, not so much by his own inward faith as by the stress and trend of the problem he has raised—following, one might say, like the Platonic Socrates, 'whither the argument leads'—he has revealed to us the lines along which alone a reconciliation for the contradictions of this present world must be found. The belief in a moral order so complete that it does not even disregard the interests of the individual and the demands of the human spirit, can only commend itself to the dispassionate judgement of our reason on the assumption that its manifestation in the temporal sphere is only partial and incomplete. In the perfect whole the antinomies may be adjusted and the pattern at which the great weaver is working grow clear in a harmony of colouring not yet discernible. Within the limits of that portion of Scripture with which this article is concerned, this wider view is only definitely asserted in the Book of Wisdom, upon the theology of which Greek

[1] Job xix. 25. [2] *Old Testament Theology*, p. 495.

thought has exerted an evident influence. For this more hopeful writer, on whose work we would so gladly have seen a chapter in Professor Cheyne's book, Immortality is a great conviction. 'God made not death.' 'The souls of the righteous are in the hands of God.' Their 'little chastening' is but the preparation for their 'great good.' Death, indeed, is deliverance since God made man in his own image for incorruption, and in the after life men receive the wages of holiness and the prize that is laid up for 'blameless souls.' This is a very distinct advance :

> 'Via prima salutis
> . . . Graia pandetur ab urbe.'

To conclude our reference to the 'Last Things,' as these Wisdom writers viewed them, it is to be observed that none of these five books is wholly devoid of all suggestion of Immortality. Even in the most sceptical of them the wider hope is now and again suggested as a possibility. Here, as in the Psalms, the movement of the writer's mind seems to carry him at times beyond the limits of the doctrine he had consciously realized. He hints, in spite of himself, at convictions destined only in later years to grow clear and strong.

And these occasional statements are of all the greater interest in that, except in the Book of Wisdom, they are never made as glorious announcements with any consciousness of their importance. These writers have received no special revelation. They have no gospel to announce. They are concerned with the present, and in some cases much perplexed by it. No Theology and no Metaphysic has shewn them the way to great convictions. It is just the problems of Human Experience which seem to assume larger proportions as the Wise Men handle them. So they are drawn beyond the beaten tracks, upon the first stages of the pathway destined to lead to 'those mighty hopes which make us men.'

IV.

Much might be said on the treatment of the subject of Man in relation to God in the Wisdom Literature. Within

the limits of this article we can do no more than suggest one or two main lines for its consideration. These writers accept the cardinal principle of Genesis ii. 7. 'God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.' So his composite nature has a double source. Even Koheleth is never led by his doubt as to man's destiny into any uncertainty as to his origin. Man is 'an image of God's own proper being.' Yet he is a subject rather than a son, and God a Sovereign rather than a Father. The Wisdom Books fall here below the level of Hosea or Deuteronomy. They know little of the piety and personal communion which finds such beautiful and intense expression in the Psalter. The attitude they love best to prescribe for man is the 'Fear of the Lord.' This fear, indeed, never quite sinks into the craven dread of a slave before an irresponsible tyrant, but neither does it ever quite rise to that fear of grieving the Divine Spirit which is not even cast out by perfect love because it is indistinguishable from it. It is sometimes true reverence; it is sometimes prudent calculation; it is 'the foundation of wisdom.' At its best it is the awe which is a direct antithesis to the 'insolence,' the ὕβρις, of the Greeks. Of the wisdom which builds up the conduct of life upon this foundation, it must be observed that it is essentially a practical quality, and that the Wise Men frequently express profound distrust of the speculative faculties and of thought for thought's sake. No advocacy of the contemplative life would ever have stirred them from this position. In that lack of the purely intellectual interest which is so marked a trait in the Semitic disposition, they abandon the higher aims of human thought as altogether out of range, and limit the functions of 'Godlike reason' to the apprehension of the immediate and practical conditions of man's welfare. Such wisdom, indeed, within its limits was an excellent thing. All moral excellencies appear to coexist with her, and the son of Sirach has noble words to say of her influence as seen in the concord of brethren, in friendship, or in the best happiness of married life. There were Labour Members in the society he knew, and, scribe

as he was, his estimate of the value of the worker does him credit: 'each becometh wise in his own work'; 'in the handiwork of their craft is their prayer.'

The most serious criticism of this practical wisdom is that, as a basis of morality, it lacks disinterestedness. It is utilitarian, and, at bottom, selfish, advocating right conduct because it promises certain advantages. It seems to share the conviction of Job's adversary, 'Doth man serve God for naught?' But we can hardly expect these wise men to abandon the almost axiomatic principle of the Old Testament that God rewards His servants, or to rise to the modern idea of a duty which will give no reason for its imperatives. Moreover, there is a right and high self-interest.

V.

We shall conclude this article by attempting a brief estimate of the services which the Wisdom writers rendered first to the life and thought of their own times, and secondly to the wider development of Religious Belief, and especially in so far as they prepared the way for Christianity.

In regard to the religious life of Israel these teachers corrected or attempted to correct the tendency to exclusive nationalism. During the course of the six centuries which separate the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar from the Birth of Christ, and which form the Middle Age of Biblical History, the sense of his separation from other peoples was strong in the Israelite. The race had been divinely chosen. The purpose of God for the Jew was imperilled when he lost his national identity. He might not forget Jerusalem in Babylon, nor share the worship of the Samaritan, nor marry the woman of alien blood, nor tolerate the foreigner in his shrine. Without this national isolation the Jew could never have discharged his appointed office. But the dangers of every phase of narrow nationalism are well known. Patriotism is not the absolute virtue. The spiritual prerogatives of the Hebrew needed the complement of a wider theology. It was the work of the wise more than of any other school of masters

in Israel to mitigate the antagonisms of national feeling and to tone down the exclusiveness of Judaism by their more human teaching. By their very silence on such points as the special relation of Jehovah to Israel, by their study of the universal problems, by their personal experience of the world, often more wide than deep, by their receptivity to Gentile influence, by their general temper, more quiet and genial in many cases than that of either the Prophets or the Priests, and by their clear conception of one God over all, these teachers exerted a generous, broadening, humanizing influence upon their contemporaries, which served in some measure to correct the spiritual dangers which are always incurred when either a people or a community or an individual claims, in order to discharge their mission, a peculiar exemption from the common movement of the world at large.

Moreover, these teachers helped to mitigate the evils of rigid legalism. The religion of Israel was conserved in the external shell or form of Ritual, Ordinances, and Law which were the special creation of the priestly schools and of which some counterpart seems to be necessary to all religions in order to preserve their continuity of existence. In the Rabbis' phrase this was the 'hedge' around the shrine. The necessity for some such protection for the religious gift of the race is evident, especially when the scanty inspiration of the post-exilic period is borne in mind. But these protective elements involve the risk of externalism, and a distinctive ministry of the Wisdom Theology was that it helped to correct this tendency. The period has been called the period of the Hagiocracy, and when the day of the Hebrew kings was over the priests' opportunity had arrived. The experience of history as to the tendencies of such epochs has been consistently the same. They involve the dangers of a caste system: they lead to a reliance on ceremonies and form: they generate a traditional conservatism, with vested interests in spiritual things, and they elaborate a cultus often so inimical to human interests that Religion is divorced from actual life. This danger arose in Israel when after the Exile the Jew came to possess a Law and

Priesthood, a Temple worship, an elaboration of ceremony, a sanctity of things and times and persons such as he had not previously known. The service of the Wise Men was to keep alive in the heart of the race other spiritual interests, wherein lay the remedy or prophylactic against mere legalism. They called men back to experience and facts. By their readiness to hold converse with their neighbours in the gate, by their demand that observances shall not be separate from conduct, by their clear sanity of teaching scornful alike of all mere theories and all casuistical pleas, above all by their honest conviction that the whole of life for man stands in a definite relationship to God, these wise masters in Israel helped to prevent or retard that division between religious forms and ethical character which is the surest token that any given race or Church or person is on the highway of spiritual decline.

The Wisdom Literature contributes also a positive element of Philosophy, Criticism, and Reflection. The greatest teachers of the Bible find it more natural to express truth than to discover or discuss it. This is almost the very conception of the Prophet. The Psalmists do the same with more of emotion and less of vision. The strength of the message of the Old Testament lies in its vivid, intuitive apprehension of the Divine Will. To some extent this implies the suppression or at least the disuse of the inquiring, reasoning, criticizing faculties of man's nature. Ultimately there can be no antagonism between Revelation and Inquiry, but practically the man who is the recipient of a Revelation is not the man who seeks for knowledge by deliberate logical methods. Yet for a complete religion, in which God may be loved with mind and soul alike, the combination of these two processes is essential. Truth may not only be given : it must also be grasped. Spiritual movements involve also movements that are intellectual. The wise men of Israel represent this necessary element of discussion, criticism, reflection, reason, philosophy, within the religion of their race. The gnomic wisdom of the Proverbs is the search for an intelligible moral order. Job is the critic of tradition, the champion of experience against theory.

Koheleth is the sceptic who wishes to believe, but will not blind himself in order to make Faith's venture easy. The Sapiential Psalms spring from different phases of the same spirit. In each case there is mind at work; thought predominates over emotion (even in Job it is more important) and over vision. Alone, without the greater ministry of the Prophet, the Lawgiver and the Psalmist, the wise would have had no data for their work, and they could themselves have created no religion: the critic never does. But they contributed to the religion of their race this important element of critical reflection, and claimed, in such manner as their age allowed, that the intellect also has its function in uniting man to God.

Finally, what of their wider service in preparing the way for Christianity? All destructive criticism acquires a positive character when it is seen to prepare the ground for a later and worthier construction. The Temple of Truth has to be rebuilt from time to time, but the glory of the 'latter house,' when fully apprehended, must bring no tears to the eyes of those who remember the earlier, unless the Church's belief in spiritual progress be at bottom a delusion. Now, the greatest of the Wisdom writers were undoubtedly destructive critics. To this class belong both Job and the author of Ecclesiastes. They repudiate current beliefs, the one denying the justice of the world's order, the other the possibility of discovering here that which will satisfy the soul of man. Neither of them even approaches the constructive standpoint nor comes within measurable distance of the fuller truth. Nevertheless they and the other numerous unknown teachers who shared their negative convictions rendered this service to later religion. They made the defects of the traditional views apparent. Their denials were the prelude to assertions. And when this thankless negative office of the sceptics is brought into its historical relationships and connected with the lost hopes of the Captivity, with the decline of Israel's national greatness, with the early doctrine of the Resurrection as taught in Daniel, with Hellenic influences in regard of Immortality, with the better elements of the teaching of the Pharisees,

and, finally, with the full 'Christianity' of the Lord Himself—only then does the true value of Job's protests and of Koheleth's pessimism stand clear. It is a far distance from Job and Solomon to the Master's teaching on eternal life or to Saint Paul's conceptions of the coming of 'that which is perfect' and of the 'house not made with hands.' But there is a real doctrinal lineage between them. The Wisdom movement was an early stage in the development of that spiritual religion which had its perfect outcome in the purest doctrines of the New Testament. Indirectly and by way of preparation these teachers help to build the shrine of the eternal whose only recognized office is the 'removing of those things that are shaken.'

In the doctrine of the 'Hokmah' school the personified Divine Wisdom bears a generally recognized resemblance to the 'Word' Who was made flesh at the Incarnation. It may be true that 'the august figure of the creative wisdom is not referred to in the New Testament and plays little part in later Jewish thought.' Possibly there is no direct consciousness in the Pauline and Johannine writings of the degree to which their Christological doctrine had been foreshadowed by the Old Testament account of the Divine Wisdom. In later Christian teachers, however, as for example in Clement of Alexandria, the doctrine of Wisdom is expressly recognized as an anticipation of the office of the Logos-Christ. The parallel, indeed, whether consciously recognized or not, is very close. In the high conception of One who is at once a Person and a Power without the restrictions of Personality, who was the offspring of Absolute Deity, who was with God in the beginning of the ways in which He is known to man, who is seated with Him on the throne as his Assessor, who is the image, effulgence, manifestation of His Nature, whose good will towards man is evident and known, and who can enter into the closest relationships alike with the religious community and with the individual soul—in such a figure it is indeed hard not to discern an anticipation of the characteristic features of Him Who was the Word of God. Thus many of the highest offices of the Christ—His revelation of the Divine Will, His

instruction of humanity, His mediatorial work as being Himself both human and divine, His relation to and embodiment in the Church, His will for man's welfare, His manifestation of the nature of the Unseen God—may all be recognized as unconsciously prophesied by the ancient doctors of Hebrew lore in their portrayal of the supramundane Wisdom. Such portrayal becomes almost portraiture when we recall Saint Paul's recognition of Christ as the 'Wisdom of God.'

Again, it is generally recognized that the religion of Jesus of Nazareth is concerned primarily with the individual. 'The care of Christianity,' said Bishop Warburton, 'is for particulars.' 'The religious individualism of the Gospel is, and must remain for all time, the true salt of the earth,' says a more modern writer. The very presupposition of the Christian communion, in which alone the individual fully realizes himself, is that every member of the race has an intrinsic and potential spiritual worth. Now, the Wise Men did not originate any movement in the direction of religious individualism. This is to be seen elsewhere, in the doctrine of Ezekiel, in the personal experience of Jeremiah, in the relation so abundantly implied in the Psalms between the soul and God. The 'Servant of the Lord' and the speaker in such Psalms as the 'De profundis' are probably persons as well as the personified community. The influence of the Sages is in line with all this. They rest upon no theory of a chosen race; they make no direct reference to the nation's sufferings; they have no vision of a great national future; their whole interest is human rather than Israelite, and their discussion of both the practical and speculative problems of life is always upon the personal scale. So concerned with man and his individual experiences these wise men are the representatives of a line of Hebrew thought which was unconsciously preparatory to the advent of that true Master in Israel, who did not hesitate to assert that a little child had value in the eyes of God, that the real kingdom was in the domain of personal experience within us, that the divine judgement was a judgement of individual lives and

works, and that the hope of personal Immortality was among the glorious yet reasonable convictions of the Faith that was to bear His name.

The Book of Job is the highest product of the Old Testament wisdom. And last among the preparatory services of the Hokmah theology to Christianity it will be appropriate to mention the foreshadowing of the life and Person of the Saviour in the character and fortunes of the central figure of the book. The comparison between the sufferings of Job and the sufferings of our Lord is made, possibly, by Saint James in his Epistle. The reading of the Book of Job during Holy Week in the churches of Origen's day is a further recognition of the parallel. Delitzsch takes it almost as a principle of interpretation that the 'real contents of the Book of Job is the mystery of the cross.' And while we must admit that older methods of interpretation were unduly prone to discover in the Old Testament types and conscious anticipations of the central Personality of the New, still there is a true contribution towards the doctrine of Christ in the theology of the Book of Job. As Professor Cheyne is concerned to write with some emphasis, 'the Book of Job *is* theological.'[1] Its principal assertion is that suffering in this life may be the destiny of the truest and noblest of the servants of God. On a national scale this had been already taught by the trials of the Captivity. Jeremiah's inward experience was a supreme evidence of this truth. The character of the Servant of the Lord is its fullest and fairest expression within the Old Testament limits. But the truth is nowhere asserted with more deliberate intention, nor in the face of greater difficulties, nor with clearer knowledge that all current opinion is against it, than in the Book of Job. The assertion of this doctrine is of all the greater value because the explanations of it are so evidently wanting. The strange partnership of Sorrow with Goodness is taught ere any insight into the true reason for it had yet arrived. So Job in his sufferings, in bearing that which is not the outcome of his own deeds, in his solitary pain among friends who cannot understand

[1] *Job and Solomon*, p. 102.

him, in his resolute consciousness of his own integrity, in his occasional moments of conviction that the God who lays this burden on him is still his friend, and finally in his silence and submission under this mysterious and appointed trial, is so far a true prophet and partaker of the sufferings of the Christ. But so far only, and not completely, we miss indeed the sustaining consciousness of God as ever with him ; we miss the element of sacrifice for others' good ; we miss the great and cheering hope of an ultimate success. But these defects in the earlier story not only throw into stronger relief the full doctrine of Christianity. They also compel a clearer recognition of the central assertion of Job's theology, the entire compatibility of Righteousness with Pain. So the Eastern patriarch in his days of calamity is a true representative of the struggles of the human spirit towards the ideal to be afterwards revealed in the Person of Him who was the Man of Sorrows, in whom men found no fault, for whose pains Humanity has known no parallels, and who while He guides His followers along all the many several roads which meet finally in the Kingdom, seems never to lead them with fuller certainty of their destination than when they follow Him along the royal road of His own most holy cross.

The Wisdom of the Hebrews was not the greatest of the spiritual products of the race. It never rose to the heights of Prophecy. Its full development was in the Middle Period when great things and great men were of the past. It often raised questions for which it could find no certain answer. It supplemented, reflected, interpreted, but it rarely possessed the power to create. It often lacked inspiration, and it never attained to so full a conviction of its own mission as the 'divine philosophy' of Greece. It could never claim to be either the most natural or the most adequate expression of the genius of the Semitic peoples, nor did it always manifest the qualities of the wisdom which cometh from above. Yet, at its best, this wisdom was a veritable Charisma—a true gift of God. Were its literature omitted from our Scriptures they would be the poorer for the loss. In rank and line with

the ideal Prophet, the ideal King, and the ideal Priest, the ideal Sage may also claim his place. Moreover, he has other and wider affinities than these. Down the ages of human history, and through all varieties of Revelation, Time and Race, he owns a certain spiritual kinship with all those greater or lesser teachers of the world of whom, when we estimate their lives and work, we may say that they sought honestly for God and Truth: that they tried to discern the real principles of life: that they strove to interpret Nature: that they struggled against sombre facts for Faith: and that they endeavoured to justify the ways of God to men. Whenever we come into close contact with members of this goodly company we understand something of the meaning of Lucretius when he wrote:

> 'Deus ille fuit, Deus, inclute Memmi,
> Qui princeps vitae rationem invenit eam, quae
> Nunc appellatur sapientia':

or the meaning of St. Paul's suggestive phrase, 'The manifold (*πολυποίκιλος*) wisdom of God': or the meaning of the Master when he said, 'Wisdom is justified of all her children.'

Art. VI.—THE UNPOPULARITY OF THE ABBEYS.

1. *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii S. Albani* a Thoma Walsingham regnante Ricardo secundo eiusdem ecclesiae praecentore compilata. Edited by H. T. Riley. 'Rolls Series.' Three volumes. (London: Longmans, 1867.)
2. Thomae Walsingham quondam monachi S. Albani *Historia Anglicana* (1272–1422). Edited by H. T. Riley. 'Rolls Series.' Two volumes. (London: Longmans, 1863–4.)

Encyclopaedia Britannica. Vol. XVI. Art. 'Monachism.' By the Rev. R. F. Littledale, LL.D., D.C.L. Ninth Edition. (Edinburgh: A. & C. Black, 1883.)

And other works.

The vividly drawn picture in a recent novel by Mr. R. H. Benson [1] has roused the sympathies of many of his readers for the great and imposing monastic institutions which fell at the word of Henry VIII., and the original objects of which were noble enough to deserve a nobler fate. Possibly it is not surprising that legends of various kinds have been invented to account for their disappearance into the limbo of the past, leaving behind them such monuments as Winchester and Canterbury Cathedrals and St. Albans Abbey, to say nothing of the abbey and priory churches, and romantic ruins which speckle the map of England. For some time the field was held by the legend that they were tenanted by lazy monks who waxed fat on the offerings made by a superstitious population, and were swept away by the righteous indignation of a Protestant people revolted at their immorality; then came the reaction which brought about the notion that they were all full of saintly men whom wicked Protestants, hating their religion, turned out to starve. As a matter of fact, Protestantism, good or bad, had little to do with their downfall, except so far as it 'unchurched' the general atmosphere of thought; and most of the accusations of immorality seem to have been trumped

[1] *The King's Achievement.* By Robert Hugh Benson. (Pitman, 1905.)

up to impress the 'man in the street'; but England doubtless hailed as a national benefit the dissolution of the monasteries, and the object of this article is to give a reason for the fact.

It is as well before dealing with the decay of the monasteries to look at their rise. It is not too much to say that they were the chief means which brought about the beginnings of the new civilization of Europe after the fall of the old Roman order. In Italy, Spain, France, Germany, Austria and England the profession of the warrior was the only one honoured, and the highborn fighter who knew how to make his hand keep his head the only aristocrat. All honest labour on the kindly earth was committed to the serfage, and the serf and his womankind had no rights to speak of. Into this condition of society the monastic foundations brought a new social as well as a new religious idea. The great robber-castles, the survival of which in Germany Charlotte Yonge describes in the *Dove in the Eagle's Nest*, and which were almost universal in every country in Western Europe at some period between the sixth and twelfth centuries, beheld rising among them, buildings the inmates of which lived without thought of fighting; the downtrodden serfs, dealt with like dogs by their rough masters, found neighbours who treated them kindly, gave alms to them when hungry, and encouraged their literary powers as Hilda did for Cædmon. Men who through sickness or accident or incapacity for pushing their way in the brutal world had failed in life, or women, widowed or deserted, might there find a safe and peaceful home. Round the abbeys were to be found the greenest meads, the richest harvest fields, the least ruinous villages of poor huts; for under the Benedictine system, as among the Lauras of the Thebaid, labour was the rule of life alike for lord or serf. The Benedictine Rule was the foundation of all the various Rules of other monastic bodies, which were practically modified Benedictine, until the rise of the Friars.

This Rule was drawn up by a man of supreme common sense. A system had to be devised by which men who bore no relation one to another had to live together in

harmony. Tempers, in those quarrelsome days, were apt to be unchecked, but plainly rebellion or quarrels would make a community hell instead of heaven. Accordingly, no one was allowed to join such a community without training in obedience, in silence, and in humility; and as idleness would infallibly have led to mischief, the time of the inmates was apportioned between worship, study and work. The intellectual were set to study, or to teach in school; the craftsman was encouraged to ply his craft, the results of his work, if unneeded by the community, being sold for its benefit, though such sale was to be 'rather under than over the market price'—the harmfulness of underselling not having occurred to minds guiltless of political economy. It was recommended that each house should have its own mill, well, garden, bakery, and handicraftsmen, so as to be independent of outsiders; and it soon happened that the growth of an abbey entailed much administrative work in the country round, though the actual labour in the fields came to be undertaken by serfs, attracted often by the gentler mastership of the monks.

There was no extreme asceticism in the Benedictine Rule. St. Benedict did not aim at producing Christian fakirs. Flesh meat was forbidden to all but the sick, but poultry, eggs, and fish might be consumed at option. Old men and children were dispensed from the rigour of the rule: the monks were to have beds with suitable coverings, and in the hot summer noons they were allowed a siesta after their midday meal. Voluntary self-denial was recommended for Lent, but not without the approval of the abbot. Sickly brethren were to be given light work. Hospitality was contemplated; the abbot was licensed to break his fast with guests, and might invite two or three to share the repast. Such meals were to be cooked by separate brethren in a separate kitchen, lest the ordinary cooks should be overworked.

The periods not taken up with prayer, meals, or sleep, were divided between manual labour and devout reading. Besides these occupations, the monks of St. Albans, whom we have chosen as a typical example, could obtain leave to

go out for walks, and recreation was evidently frequently taken. Study was earnestly prosecuted, and the monastery schools in England were the only ones existing until Alfred summoned St. Grimbald from Flanders to instruct the young nobles of his court. The Benedictines soon became a learned order, and in their monasteries the masterpieces of the classics were preserved to later ages.

It is plain that monasteries were regarded as havens of peace by the men and women whose duties lay in the fierce and tumultuous life outside ; for such persons thought it worth while to pay large sums to important abbeys for a corrody, or board and lodging within the abbey precincts—or for the privilege of being buried in the holy ground of the abbey. Monastic life also greatly raised the position of women. A vocation other than marriage rendered the status of unmarried women equal or superior in dignity to that of their married sisters ; the abbess of an important convent was often a much greater personage than the dame of the neighbouring castle. Rank, doubtless, often brought promotion with it as a matter of course, but merit and ability could lift their possessor to the highest posts in the Church, as in the case of Anselm and Grosseteste.

Another privilege of the abbeys made for good rather than evil while the hand of the law was capricious or uncertain in its action. This was the privilege of sanctuary. Where it was the custom to hang a criminal offhand, without waiting for any evidence for the defence, it made for justice that there should be a possibility of respite and appeal : it might do so at this day in the United States if negroes in danger of lynching were allowed to take sanctuary in the nearest church. The right of sanctuary, however, was not always respected, and then all the abbeys, not only in England, but on the Continent also, were up in arms. However jealous Bury and St. Albans, Glastonbury and Westminster might be of each other's privileges, they all stood shoulder to shoulder to protest against a common indignity.

The palmy days of the English monasteries lay between

the Conquest and the Peasant Revolt in 1378, known in contemporary literature as the Hurling-time. During that period they grew in power and wealth, and their very efficiency did much to bring about the time when they would become unnecessary; but it is possible that if as corporate bodies they had shewn consideration for anything except their own interests, use might have been found for them for a far longer period than was the case.

Such an abbey as Bury or St. Albans was a centre of civilization under the shadow of which it was impossible that a town, more or less important, should not grow to life. But where a town of freeborn Englishmen existed, it was equally impossible that sooner or later men should not struggle for the civic freedom which is the birthright of our race, and that the abbey, a great corporation with interests beyond the shores of England, should not strive as fiercely to retain what it considered its sacred rights.

Such a conflict is graphically described by monks of St. Albans in *Gesta Abbatum*, which gives the biography of the various abbots as they struck their contemporary or nearly contemporary chroniclers. One of these chroniclers was Walsingham, who has also given us the history of England from a monastic point of view, and who certainly had the power of telling a story, whether homely or marvellous.

We find the abbey of St. Albans in the fourteenth century a highly flourishing and important institution. It was extra-diocesan, and when a new abbot was elected, his election was confirmed, not by the bishop but by the Pope. How much the Pope interfered in the elections probably depended on his prosperous or unprosperous condition at the time. In 1326, when Richard of Wallingford was made abbot, his election was disputed. He spent upon his visit to Avignon, including the journey, a sum which Walsingham assesses at 923*l.* 10*s.* 11*d.*—at least ten thousand pounds in modern coinage; and in addition a sum of 720 marks representing the revenues of the abbey during the interval between Wallingford's informal and formal election, termed a vacancy of the benefice. Again,

if the abbey desired to convert one of the parishes the great tithes of which went to the abbey from a vicarage into a rectory, it had to pay the Pope in fees as much as twenty years' tithe. The freedom of a great abbey from diocesan supervision was dearly bought by becoming a milch-cow to the Pope, whether at Rome or Avignon ; and we may well believe that the natural dislike of the English mind at seeing English money leave the country must have been intensified when its destination was a city under the influence of the very country with which England had fought for a hundred years.

Once elected, the abbot ruled a little kingdom with several dependencies, each of which was a considerable estate in itself. There were several daughter houses, each under a prior, which went by the name of cells, though they were by no means necessarily small. There was a cell at Hatfield Peverel, a cell at Redburn, a cell as far off as Tynemouth, and probably several more. The *Gesta Abbatum* gives a catalogue of the property acquired by the abbey in the reign of each abbot : between 1260 and 1290 in Abbot Roger's time, the abbey acquired nearly 100 new possessions, among which are such items as these ;

Market at Codecote on Friday.
Fair at Codecote.
Five messuages in Fishpool Street.
Shop in St. Albans.
Two pieces of land.
Common in Barnet Wood.
Harpsfield to find one horse for the Abbot's journeys to Tynemouth ;

—and so on for page after page. Besides these, there were various ' rights ' which brought in money to the abbey, and which it never let slip. It had a ' right ' to contributions from rectories and vicarages, and a ' right ' to the chattels of executed felons. Such rights were sometimes disputed, but the abbey won its cause. The Benedictine system of self-containedness had caused the abbey to keep its own lawyers, as it kept its own bakers or cooks, and its causes were tried in its own courts. ' I'll be judge, I'll be jury,

said cunning old Fury, I'll try the whole cause, and condemn you to death.' The mouse's fate was generally that of the abbey's opponents also.

The most oppressive of the abbey rights were those which claimed for the abbey corporation a monopoly of some necessity or convenience required by the people outside its walls over whom it claimed jurisdiction. Where wheat or barley was the staple article of food it was a necessity that grain should be ground ; and the abbeys, like other landholders, when they had erected a mill, naturally charged a fee to outsiders who made use of it. But as the neighbouring population increased in numbers and in mechanical skill, they preferred to erect their own mill and charge their own prices. This interfered with the abbey perquisite of fees for 'multure,' and the law was called in to forbid the erection of any second mill within the abbey jurisdiction, or to pull it down if it had been erected. Then handmills were devised which could be worked at home, and the abbey demanded the surrender of the handmills. Throughout the fourteenth century the mill question was a fruitful source of litigation and ill-feeling.

The same system of monopoly held in the case of education. The abbey of St. Albans kept a good school, which the citizens of the neighbouring town attended, and whence the more promising scholars were sent with exhibitions to Oxford. It was probably more efficient than a private-venture school was likely to be ; but the abbey was not content to offer better wares than its competitors. It excommunicated a private schoolmaster who opened a second school in the town without the authorization of the abbot.

The town which we now call St. Albans, had grown up under the shadow of the abbey, but it became much averse to be called by the name of the abbey's patron saint. The old Roman name of Verulam had lived on, or been revived, under the form of Warlhamchester, and a legend had arisen that it had been refounded by a special charter of King Offa. Whether King Offa had been in a sufficiently advanced state of education to bestow charters was not a question which perplexed the honest citizens ;

but plainly the abbey chroniclers resented their desire to have a name and history of their own, apart from the abbey. The jurisdiction which the abbey claimed over the town was an ever-increasing source of bitterness. The abbey was a corporation, with as little conscience as any lay corporation, bent on enlarging its own interests, and managed by far abler men than the town could boast, wholly inaccessible to bribes or compromises. Behind the abbey lawyers lay the machinery of the law of the land, easily manipulated in the abbey's courts ; behind the law lay the authority of the king, easily reached by the abbot or the abbot's friends in high place ; behind the king lay the power of appeal to the Pope. A plaintiff seldom had money enough to go on litigating for ever while all these authorities were summoned to crush him one by one. The abbey had giant power and it used it like a giant, without mercy to man or beast. One of the abbey tenants, John Chiltern, not paying his rent, his herd of fifty cows was seized for distraint. The abbot threatened that if he did not pay up his cows would not be fed. 'I am not going to be dictated to by my beasts,' was the reply ; and starved the poor beasts were. The chronicler seems to feel that the act needs some apology, and lays it to the advice of the lawyers.

But perhaps the oppression that weighed heaviest upon the townsfolk was the fact that whereas outside the abbey jurisdiction temporal crimes were visited by temporal punishment, within it the penalty of excommunication was adjudged for any opposition to the abbot's will. The fallacy which some preachers still proclaim, that 'a sin against an infinite being is an infinite sin and demands infinite punishment,' was carried out in the code of abbey law. To snare a rabbit in a layman's wood was an ordinary offence ; to snare the same rabbit on abbey ground was a sin against St. Alban, and became sacrilege. It was hardly surprising if the townsmen felt that the abbey played its game with loaded dice.

The administration of the abbey varied with the character of the abbot in power. Abbot Hugh, in 1308–26, was a free-handed and somewhat extravagant personage. Once

he went to visit a neighbour called Hethersett who had an infant son in the cradle. The child cried—according to the hardhearted chronicler, it was made to cry on purpose—and Abbot Hugh granted it a pension of 40 shillings yearly for its life, which lasted fifty years. Various indications suggest that the morals as well as the expenditure of the Abbey were free during Hugh's reign; but Abbot Richard of Wallingford, who succeeded him, was a reformer. It was he who spent a fortune on going to Avignon; and during the nine years of his abbacy he was afflicted with leprosy, and had to wear a white linen mask. In spite of his infirmity, he ruled both monastery and town with a high hand. The prior and brethren of Redburn were forbidden to hunt, or to leap over and pull down their neighbours' hedges, and the discipline of the monastery in general was tightened. But the town felt his iron hand as much as the monastery. During Abbot Hugh's lax rule the town had made a seal of office and had collected for its own expenses, thus denying the jurisdiction of the abbey. One of the townsmen was a 'bold bad man' named Marshall, who probably deserved his fate; the abbot sent his squire to apprehend him for adultery. A scuffle ensued in the town, in which both Marshall and the abbot's squire were killed. When the trial was held, the townsmen refused to allow the jury to be packed with 'aliens'—whether aliens from the town or country we do not know. But Abbot Richard fought them and won his cause. Then he turned his attention to the mill question, and went to law with the town with regard to it. Under Abbot Hugh's rule three mills had been built for the town, and eighty handmills were owned by various citizens: thirteen of these were considered to have legal justification. In the reign of Henry III., certain charters had been granted to the town which gave the townspeople definite rights as against the abbey, and had Edward I. been on the throne instead of Edward II., they might have kept them. But Abbot Richard had influence and powerful friends, and he determined to crush the town once for all by making it surrender its charters. His manner of carrying out his design was

rather crafty than Christian. He invited the townspeople to a feast, and prevented one of the most influential of them, Richard of Pyriton, from departing with the rest. Then, whether by threats or promises—the chronicler seems rather hazy, and possibly ashamed, regarding the methods pursued—Pyriton was induced to enter into a bond to persuade his fellow-townsmen to yield to the abbot's desires. Whether *force majeure* was used to induce Pyriton and the townsmen to yield what in the next generation many of them died to regain, or whether spiritual threats extorted consent, we shall never now know; but the abbot triumphed all along the line. He placed the town under a bond of 3,000 marks forfeit to recognize the abbey's jurisdiction, he pulled down the three water-mills and cemented their six mill-stones into the Abbot's parlour, and he forced the townsmen to surrender their much prized handmills.

For forty years the town remained prostrate beneath the hand of the abbey, and in 1349 began the long and eventful abbacy of Thomas de la Mare, whose gravestone may still be seen to the south of the high altar. Abbot Thomas was a man of fine presence and high birth. He had suave manners and a cold heart, and he inherited the traditions of Richard of Wallingford. He was of spotless morals, and he had himself scourged every Friday by his own monks; but he seems to have been crafty rather than courageous in dealing with his opponents—indeed the abbots of St. Albans, as a rule, do not shine brilliantly in personal courage. He was utterly unscrupulous in supporting the rights of the abbey, whether in religious or secular matters. The Franciscan and Dominican Orders formulated a combined request to be allowed to hear confessions and to preach within the jurisdiction of the abbey. This was refused with contempt, much as a non-resident bishop of George II.'s time would have refused a similar request from a Methodist preacher. The chroniclers tell how, a certain allowance of bread being withdrawn from the Dominicans, they had the impertinence to appeal to Rome, successfully, for its continuance. 'From this

others may learn in time to shake off the viper from their bosom, and to remove the mouse from the handmill, the thorn from the eye, and from the side the deadly dart!' When the chronicler stops his narrative of the 'Hurling-Time' to suggest the cause of the troubles, he fixes on the deterioration of the Mendicant Orders as the cause of the wrath of Heaven, as worse than the laxness of bishops, the irreligion of nobles, or the drunkenness and immorality of the people, and quotes the proverb 'A friar, a liar.' It is instructive to see that the possibility of fault in his own Order does not strike him at all. Of John Wiclif he speaks as the beast which has issued from the mouth of hell, but in connexion with a story of the desecration of the Host by a fourteenth century Kensitite. However, it seems plain that the atmosphere of thought in the abbey must have been of the high-and-dry kind, and it is curious to think of an ecclesiastical circle in which Thomas Aquinas must have been regarded as a daring Dominican innovator.

Meanwhile the town of St. Albans, though crushed, still cherished the hope of some day recovering its liberty. It was not its 'hooligan' element, but its grave and sober citizens, who waited for an opportunity of asserting their rights. William Grindecobbe's two brothers were brethren in the abbey, and Richard of Wallingford was namesake and kinsman of the redoutable leper abbot. Grindecobbe, and probably his colleagues also, had been educated at the abbey school, where Grindecobbe had been an exhibitioner. Hostilities began by small annoyances such as would now be dealt with at quarter sessions or in county courts, but then were thought worthy to be punished by excommunication. A wall surrounded the abbey precincts, and against this wall some of the citizens had built houses; and one had gone so far as to break a window in the wall, which enabled him to look into the sacrist's garden. The abbot determined to build a clay wall outside the abbey wall to stop this nuisance and to have all houses pulled down within a certain distance of the wall. This, however, was an infringement of the freedom of the townsmen outside the abbey: Grindecobbe and some others forbade the brethren who

came to survey for the new wall to proceed with their measurements, and they were driven away with the measuring rod of one of them broken across his back. Grindecobbe was publicly excommunicated, and had to do penance in his shirt before the Chapter, his relation to the brethren and his position in the town excusing him from making his amends before the whole congregation. The chronicler conceives this to have been the reason 'that in the insurrection of the commons he raged with the greater fury, and more importunately spoke to demand liberties, not only for himself, but for his neighbours, poor and unknown.' That a man should demand liberties for himself the chronicler thinks but natural; but for the poor? The standard of monastic philanthropy does not seem to have been high.

But at last the abbey found its autocratic government no longer unquestioned. In June 1378 the Peasant Revolt broke out. All over England the downtrodden serfs were rising to demand of the king their rights and liberties against their masters; and the abbey towns, such as Bury and St. Albans, saw their chance of shaking off the heavy hand of their oppressors. One day the men of Barnet came to St. Albans with the news that Tiler was at Highbury with 20,000 men, threatening to march north to deliver all villans from their lords, and to give to fire and sword all who opposed him. Barnet suffered from abbey oppression as well as St. Albans, and desired to know if the townsmen would join them in making an effort to end the tyranny of the abbey. The townsmen were solid citizens, and deliberated over two courses, each in its way dangerous. They might wait till Tiler and his Kentishmen arrived and die at their hands, while their homes were sacked by such anarchists as Jack Straw; or they might go to Tiler as friends, and persuade him to turn his attention in another direction, disregarding the probability that any attempt to communicate with the rebels would brand them as disloyal in the eyes of the abbey. Grindecobbe, Cadyndon, Barker and Wallingford, determined to consult the abbot. They found the abbot and brethren half wild with fear, and

ready to catch with thankfulness at the notion of the townsmen's intercession for the abbey with Tiler. He proposed to send four of the brethren with the townsmen as delegates from the abbey, but these brethren, hearing that Tiler had sworn a special hatred to 'religious,' esteemed discretion the better part of valour, left the townsmen to deal with Tiler, and rode on to London to appeal to the king. Tiler told the townsmen that if they could manage their matters without him, well; if not, they might tell the abbot that he would send twenty thousand men to shave his beard, and hang him and his monks from the minster tower.

Grindecobbe and his companions, on leaving Tiler, thought that their opportunity had come to redress the wrongs of their town by getting the king to command the abbey to restore their lost charters. Richard was riding out to Mile-end to meet the Essex men there encamped, and six times on his way Grindecobbe prostrated himself in the royal path and implored justice against the abbey. Excited, interested, and amused, the boy king made no difficulty in promising an order to the abbot to deliver up the charters, and Wallingford remained behind to bring back the order when drawn out. The other men returned home at once with the good news of their success, and crowds of excited villans who fondly believed that their own liberty was won, crowded into the town. As they exulted, the brethren despaired. Prior John de Moote, eventually abbot, was a most unpopular personage, for having two houses in the town, one on each side of the Fish Market, he had joined them by building another across, shutting out all air and light from the market. He, with the subchancellor and three more of the brethren, took horse by night for Tynemouth, and were seen no more at St. Albans till the troubles ended.

The arrival of Richard of Wallingford with the promised demand to the abbot from the king took place next day. He made a triumphal entrance into the town, one of his men bearing before him the banner of the insurgents—the pennon of St. George of England. His appearance was

taken by the mob as allowing licence for an attack on the abbey, but this was by no means the desire of the townsmen, and Wallingford, taking the flagstaff in his arms, planted it in front of the abbey gate. He bade the crowd to guard it, and by no means to advance beyond it, while the townsmen went into the abbey to communicate the king's letter to the abbot.

The abbot, on hearing the townsmen's request for an audience, at first declared that he would rather die than part with any of the privileges of the blessed Alban to his enemies; but there was a menacing crowd outside the abbey, and the abbot came into the nave followed by a procession of brethren. Wallingford with all due reverence handed him the letter in a silken bag. It began 'Very dear in God,' and went on to 'will and command' the restoration to the burgesses of the charters of Henry III. which they had had to surrender, concerning rights of common, of pasture, of fishing, and of certain other commodities expressed in the same charters; and it ended 'Richard Rex.' The abbot read it and pleaded that it was against his conscience to part with St. Alban's patrimony; but Grindecobbe reminded him that what the law gave the law could take away. 'The king's grant has done much damage to the towns when the monasteries have had his ear; now we of the towns have gained his ear, and we trust to win back our losses.' The abbot pleaded for time to consult his Chapter, but he was reminded that the mob was at the abbey doors, and what had to be done must be done at once.

Abbot Thomas wrung his hands. 'Alack, alack, good neighbours, for this thirty-two years I have been your easy abbot and father, and never harmed you or done you ill; when you have been in straits with pestilence or famine, my hand has been always open to supply your needs; and now you seek, for no cause, to undo me, your easy friend and master.' They replied politely that the town had no personal grudge against the abbot, and would have preferred to leave the question of the charters untouched until his death; but at this moment they had no choice, being

in danger themselves of being torn in pieces by the mob if they tarried too long. The blows upon the great door gave point to their words, and the abbot implored them to go forth to pacify the people, leaving Wallingford behind to fetch the charters out. He promised them the charters which Henry III. had given and Abbot Richard had taken away, the bond for 3,000 marks to ensure their good behaviour, and the bonds of servitude and other parchments signed under compulsion from the abbey.

The rest of the deputation went out to pacify the mob, and Grindecobbe perceived that unless some other entertainment were provided he would not be able to keep them off the abbey. He suggested that a bonfire should be prepared at the Market Cross, where the bonds of servitude should be consumed. The crowd was lured away from the abbey, and Grindecobbe exhorted his followers to keep order, and to put to shame those who spake of the commons as law-breakers. Two houses, however, belonging to the abbey bailiffs were sacked, and their contents destroyed like the property of John of Gaunt at the Savoy, a few days before.

Wallingford came out with the promised charters and bonds, and the work of destruction of the latter went on merrily, until a whisper went round that the most valuable of all the charters had not been returned. Old men had seen the charter *De Libertatibus Villanorum*, and remembered how it began with two emblazoned letters, one in gold and one in azure. The bonfire lost its interest, and the mob rushed back to the abbey to demand the missing charter. The townsmen went in again to the abbot to ask for it, and while they were within the crowd broke open the abbey prison. They let all the prisoners out except one, a murderer, whom they hanged on the spot to prove that they were on the side of the law. Then the abbot himself came out of the west door with a great book under his arm, in which was a copy of the lost charter. He said that he had asked the major brethren, and they were questioning the minor brethren, but the original of the charter he solemnly swore he had never seen. This was

undoubtedly true, for he was too much terrified to refuse it if he had had it.

Now arose a cry for the six precious millstones which had been cemented down in the pavement of the Abbot's Parlour. The abbot said that the millstones could not be taken up without tools; but tools were immediately forthcoming, and Grindecobbe led a party into the Abbot's Parlour, and brought out the millstones with him. Then for some time longer he kept the mob quiet by breaking up the millstones, forming the people into line, and bidding them each to come up in orderly fashion to receive his chip of stone for remembrance, 'like men who receive holy bread in church.' Hardly was this finished when a party of Barnet men were found to have laid faggots before the inner door of the abbey—the outer door had been broken open when the prisoners were released—and would have fired the door, had not one of the townsmen climbed on to the faggots and shouted that it was for St. Alban's men to do what they would to their own abbey, and strangers were to have no part in it.

The abbot here produced a diversion by sending out a large provision of bread and ale to appease the hungry crowd. He had to confess that he could not find *De Libertatibus Villanorum*, but promised that if the crowd would disperse, he would make out a new charter to the same effect. Grindecobbe pointed out that a new charter would not be in any way the same thing. 'For we do not desire to extort from you new and unjust claims: we come to ask for our own, to which we have a right in law and justice.'

The abbot promised to continue the search, and the night came down upon the disputants. During the day a party of the townsmen had gone round to the various woods and commons which the abbey had enclosed and destroyed the gates as an assertion of the town's right: and in spite of the missing charter, the citizens were triumphant. But that night news came which altered the situation. Tiler was dead, and with his death the abbot's panic was at an end; the next day two knights with a party

of men at arms came to the abbey with a second letter from the king, urging the townsmen to do no damage to the abbot. The townsmen professed themselves glad that the letter had arrived to strengthen the cause of order, and proceeded to call a meeting at the Moot Hall, where they proclaimed that all creditors of the abbey were to take their bonds thither at once and demand quittance—payment to creditors seems usually to have been made or delayed at the good pleasure of the abbey bursar. A procession of townsmen was also appointed to walk the confines of the town proclaiming the rights of way, the rights of common, and the rights of fishery won from the abbey.

Nevertheless, the tide had turned. For a few days the abbot went on granting charters freely to Barnet and the other towns which demanded them; but at the same time he was gradually increasing the force of men-at-arms within the abbey. He had the missing charter drawn out afresh and sealed with St. Alban's seal; but the chronicler observes that the seal stuck to the wax, a sure sign that the Saint disapproved. Then came the news that the king was going to send Sir Walter Atte Lee as commissioner, with two knights as assessors, to inquire into the disturbance, and great was the joy of the abbey and the searching of heart in the town.

Many of the burgesses at once began to move themselves and their goods out of the place, and Grindecobbe, as the leader who had demanded the charters, was strongly urged to take flight from St. Albans. Grindecobbe replied that he was not ashamed of his actions; he had acted according to law under the king's seal, there were thirty towns and villages in league with the townsmen, and if the commissioner's intentions were not honest, they were still strong enough to whip him out of the town. He headed a party of the burgesses who rode out to meet the commissioner and escort him with all honour into St. Albans. Two days later he was arrested as he was riding home unarmed from a public meeting called by the commissioner in Derfold Wood, thrown into the abbey prison, and carried off next day to Hertford jail, beyond reach of rescue

from the townsmen. With him were imprisoned Wallingford and the other leading citizens who had opposed the abbey, which now, taking courage, once more demanded the surrender of the charters.

The trial was held at Hertford before a judge known to be in the abbey interest; the abbey squires, the witnesses for the prosecution, were accusing the prisoners with vehement invective, and their condemnation was imminent, when a messenger came post haste to the abbey to recall the squires. The commissioner had sent his troops off elsewhere, the abbey was almost denuded of armed defenders, and the mob was once more thundering at its gates for the release of Grindecobbe. Next day Grindecobbe was sent for and offered his life if he would return to St. Albans and persuade his fellow-townsmen to surrender the charters, under penalty of a heavy bail to the town if he disappeared. His fellow-prisoners persuaded him to accept the offer, and once again he stood in the Moot Hall; but this time his popularity appeared greatly lessened by the dread of his friends that he would take the chance to disappear and leave them to pay his bail. They were safe enough. Grindecobbe, 'cujus cor,' says the chronicler, 'jam induratum in malo fuerat,' urged them to disregard his own life. 'Do that, and nothing else, which you would have done had I been slain yesterday at Hertford. My life matters little, but your freedom is worth the death of many; so hold fast what you have won.'

The crowd was filled with impotent fury. They came together in the market-place and clamoured for Grindecobbe to lead them against the abbey, to take Sir Walter and 'humanely' cut off his head, to do anything to save himself. Grindecobbe made his last appeal to them to keep quiet. No good, he said, would result from further violence—only fresh misery for the town. They had best go home and give no further cause of offence. Percy and Warwick were on their march to occupy the place. 'What we did before we did according to law, but if we did this much evil would ensue, both to us and to the innocent in

this town.' He surrendered himself on the appointed day, and was taken back to prison.

The abbot's troubles were not at an end. Warwick and Percy delayed their coming to quiet their own estates, and the townsmen chaffed the supposed disappointment of the abbot in a doggerel song which infuriated him :

> ' Salt thy flesh, good Abbot, bake full hard thy flour,
> Sell thy goodly butter, lest it turneth sour ! '

The women would not give a civil word to the soldiers, and the crown of the offences was the story that was told of the abbot's consenting to treat with Tiler. This was, unfortunately, true, though he would have been glad to forget it. The abbot sent word to the king that he was ' delated ' in the town, and Richard with his army marched to St. Albans to punish the enemies of the abbey.

When the townsmen heard that the king was really coming, the prospect of their homes sacked and ruined broke down all their courage. They agreed to restore the charters, to replace the millstones, to pay the fine imposed by the abbot, and to rebuild the wrecked houses belonging to the abbey. But they were not yet so tame in the abbot's hand as to agree to deliver up their champions to death at his will. The first jury summoned at the trial refused to indict or convict the malefactors, saying that they knew no malefactors to be indicted. A second jury indicted, but refused to convict ; a third jury was tricked into convicting. Grindecobbe, with a score of his comrades, was hanged on a great gallows outside the town, and the bodies were left swinging there through the dog-days to poison the air. An attempt was made to take the bodies down and give them Christian burial, but it was baffled by the vigilance of the abbey watchers, and the chronicler makes brutally merry over the gruesome condition of the month-old corpses, and the fact that the burgesses were forced to re-hang them, some of them in chains taken off their own dogs, the original chains being lost. ' Because it was right that these detractors, perjured and hateful to God, should be shewn to be worse than dogs, in that their dogs

being set free, they themselves should be chained and compelled to so disgusting a servitude.'

Abbot Thomas was not satisfied with hanging his principal opponents ; he also determined to stop the tongues of the survivors. He sent his bailiffs to proclaim that whereas the townsmen and townswomen were known to speak slanderously of the abbot, to say that he had acted unlawfully to their hurt and damage, and to trouble with their tongues him and his servants ; henceforth every man convicted of false speaking against the abbot should be hanged, and every woman burnt alive. The chronicler does not mention whether any executions on this ground actually followed ; but as one of the victims hanged had been a boy who had caught a rabbit on the day when the town rights were proclaimed over the abbey enclosures, and who in consequence had been apprehended for sacrilege, we cannot suppose that Abbot Thomas was too merciful to allow them to take place.

Such is the picture of abbey administration as given by its own chronicler, who plainly considers the opponents of the abbot the opponents of Heaven. His merit is that his relation is an honest one ; he neither excuses the abbot, nor vilifies the citizens except with epithets. To him, right and wrong mean the advancement or the damage of the interests of the abbey and its patron saint; and anything further removed from the ethics of Christianity it is impossible to conceive.

Grindecobbe, a civic martyr, died an ignominious death and was denied Christian burial ; Abbot Thomas, in extreme old age, passed away in the odour of sanctity. Nevertheless the patriotic citizen won in the long run. From the time of the Peasant Revolt onward, the abbeys withered and perished, and a century and a half later the end came. The prior who had run away before the riots succeeded Abbot Thomas, and squandered the revenues of the abbey in building, leaving it in debt. In 1410 a warning note was sounded when Parliament proposed to confiscate all the temporalities held by bishops, abbots, and priors, and petitioned the Crown to employ their revenues in paying a

standing army of knights and soldiers, endowing a hundred hospitals, and making small yearly payments to the secular clergy. It was not a new notion in England that religious property could be confiscated; 'alien priories' had been dissolved in 1337 by Edward III., and were dissolved again in 1416. Though the petition was not granted, the fact of its being made was a sign of the change of the times. For a century longer the abbeys lingered on, shorn of their old power as of their old usefulness. Like the wicked uncle in the 'Babes in the Wood,' 'their lands were mortgaged all,' and the less wealthy gradually ceased to exist for want of funds. Their schools and their doles still fulfilled a function in social life, but they no longer possessed the able administrators of the previous century, and in the records of Archbishop Warham's Visitations it is plain that they were heavily encumbered, and were a hindrance rather than a help to the natural development of the country. In 1523 Wolsey obtained bulls from the Pope authorizing the suppression of forty small monasteries on the score of uselessness, and the application of their funds to educational purposes. By this time only half the number of religious houses founded in England were in existence; the others had died out.

They still had a potential power for trouble. They might be superannuated and tottering, but Giant Pope, more vigorous than in Bunyan's allegory, might be called upon at any time to back them up in a quarrel with Crown or people. No patriotic Englishman would have raised a finger to keep them in their condition of antiquated privilege, and it was expected that if they were dissolved their funds would be devoted to national education. The greed of Henry VIII. and his courtiers deprived England of what might have been the finest school system in Europe.

Whether the Reformation had come or not, it is plain that the abbeys were practically dead and must have been dissolved; but neither Protestantism nor moral indignation were concerned in the matter. They perished simply because they had become a social incubus.

M. Bramston.

Art. VII.—BOOKS ABOUT CHILDREN.

1. *The History of the Fairchild Family, or the Child's Manual.* Being a Collection of Stories calculated to show the Importance and Effects of a Religious Education. By Mary Martha Sherwood. Part I., 1818; Part II., 1842; Part III., 1847. (London: Wells Gardner, Darton & Co.)
2. *The Works of Juliana Horatia Ewing* [1841–1885]. Sixteen volumes. (S.P.C.K.)
3. *A Child's Garden of Verses.* By Robert Louis Stevenson. (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1893.)
4. *The Golden Age* (1896) and *Dream Days* (1899). By Kenneth Grahame. (London: John Lane.)
5. *The Little White Bird.* By J. M. Barrie. (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1902.)
6. *The Noisy Years.* By Mabel Dearmer. (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1902.)
7. *A Romance of the Nursery.* By E. Allen Harker. (London: John Lane, 1903.)
8. *Concerning Paul and Fiammetta.* By the same. (London: Edward Arnold, 1906.)
9. *New Treasure Seekers.* By E. Nesbit. (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1904.)
10. *Oswald Bastable and Others.* By the same. (London: Wells Gardner, Darton & Co., 1905.)

Some twenty years ago Mr. Watts-Dunton wrote an essay on *The New Hero*—his new hero was the child. But the cult of childhood is not so new after all; it is at least coeval with Christianity. All through the Middle Ages artists were inspired by the thought of the Mother and the Child, while the sweet Lives of the little saints read as though they were written in the childhood of the world. The Chancellor Gerson, reformer and controversialist, gathered the children about him and besought their prayers. Fra Angelico found in them the types for angelic beings; and Savonarola, notwithstanding his austerity, was humble in the presence of innocents. At the Renaissance, Sir Thomas

More could forget his ermine and his dignity, and write pretty letters full of playfulness to 'his sweet babes.' Even Montaigne admits his delight 'in the running up and down of children'; and Bishop Andrewes in his prayers did not forget to thank God 'for the sweetening of the world by infants.'

Shakespeare introduced more than one pert little boy into his plays. He knew the value of children in art—their *naïveté* and pathos. Fuller dedicated his *Pisgah's Sight of Palestine* to a little lord; and, later still, 'Namby Pamby' Phillips wrote odes to the small offspring of great people. These appreciations were intended to flatter parents, and Gay was perhaps the first writer of distinction in England who deliberately wrote for the very young. Later still, Shenstone found his happiest inspiration in a village school; and Wordsworth glorified child-life in his 'Intimations of Immortality.'

And yet, for all this, Mr. Watts-Dunton was right. The child as a hero for poets and novelists is new. He now sits enthroned in the place once filled by his elder sister. Not her wilful whim, but his unconscious humour lightens the pages of fiction. We are asked to weep above a little cot rather than over a hopeless love entanglement. Our delight in heroism is satisfied by a small boy with a tin sword; we no longer demand a Guardsman with a Victoria Cross.

But how are we to account for this prevalent taste for the nursery and its details? At first sight it might be supposed to spring from the great number of women writers and a probable preponderance of women readers. But we remember at once that child life has been delineated and interpreted as successfully by men. Swinburne, Pater, Stevenson, Kenneth Grahame, William Canton, Barrie, and Kipling have all contributed of their best to this new literature. It is not lacking in virility; it is amazing in its variety.

The Cynic, indeed, may remark that we live in a sentimental age, and are suffering not only from a softening of the heart but also from a softening of the brain; that the

old world approaches its dotage, and would conceal its waning powers by an affectation of childishness. But every other age was equally sentimental; and our sentimentality is surely more healthy than that of our grandparents. It is better to cry over *Misunderstood* than over the tales supplied to Lydia Languish. Our emotions find a more natural vent than in the days of Byronism; and it is something to our credit that we can read Mrs. Sherwood and cannot read the Countess of Blessington.

The Pessimist might provide a better explanation. He might urge that we are tired and disillusioned; that we would escape from the actualities of life into a world where everything is played at. Life has become so complex and so disappointing that we long for simplicity and Nursery Tea. We like to remember the time when we could echo that couplet of Stevenson's:

> 'The world is so full of a number of things,
> I am sure we should all be as happy as Kings.'

We find a pleasure in self-mockery when we attend seriously to the mimicry of children. We are quizzing ourselves when we put into the mouths of little people the principles by which we live. Reduced to the simple terms of an infantile vocabulary, much that is thought of as recondite wisdom is shewn to be folly in disguise.

Whatever truth may lurk in the Pessimist's explanation as to the popularity of nursery books, it certainly does not account for their being written. Most of the authors are genuine child-lovers; they write of what interests themselves. Some of them write so well because they have remained so young, and for those young in heart the word 'pessimism' has no meaning.

The Optimist also has his explanation. He sees in this literature the guarantee that the ties of family life are not loosened, that we still reverence Motherhood and the sanctities of home. He thinks also that we are beginning to understand what Our Blessed Lord meant when He told us to become as little children. He hopes that our faces are set towards the Kingdom of Heaven. He speaks of the

instinctive devotion of men to an ideal of purity and virginity.

There is much to be said for the Optimist's point of view, but it is not to be justified by all the facts. Mrs. Ewing and Mrs. Allen Harker do indeed glorify the home, but many of our little heroes in fiction are without any reverence for the home or anything else. They are delightful fawn-like figures, inconsequent and irresponsible, living their own lives for themselves alone, and they only regard their elders in so far as they minister to their pleasures or mar them. Now Puck provides plentiful entertainment in a book. He touches us lightly to laughter or tears. We are delighted to hear of his tricks. We should like to play with him, kiss and tickle him; but we refuse to regard him as a moral being or to consider his moral significance.

Some recent books go further and make our hearts ache. Mr. W. H. Hudson, for instance, recently produced one which is called *A Little Boy Lost*. It is beautiful as Nature is beautiful, and Mr. Hudson is a Naturalist. Like Nature, too, it suggests much that is tender while it remains heartless. The little boy, predestined to wander, loses his mother without a regret, escapes from the kindly savage women who would have fostered him, and from the beautiful Lady of the Hills who loved him as her own child. He longs to know, to see, to touch, to feel; he is sensitive to all that is beautiful; he delights in all that is living; with a shout of joy he welcomes the sea. He can weep over a dead flamingo, and laugh with Old Jacob; he accepts caresses in the comfortable lap of the Lady of the Hills; but he has no heart for his kind, no gratitude, no memory, no morals. He never feels the need of support. It is a fairy tale wonderfully told; and yet we closed the book with a sigh—how hopeless and unsatisfying are all things without God in the world!

Must we, then, conclude that the motive which inspires the Nursery Literature is restricted to an artistic appreciation of childhood? By no means; and yet it is often nothing more. Children are so pretty; they are such

responsive pets; their blunders are so amusing in story-books; and their naughtiness reminds us of a past that we like to remember, do not repent of, and at least in the story-books do not condemn. Their ambitions are so grotesque, often so grandiose; their imagination is unfettered by the possibilities of prosaic life. Their woes are so real, so like our own, that we can sympathize, and yet so transitory that we can smile. They are so weak, and small, and helpless that their little hands appeal to our compassion; they are so impertinent, noisy, and assertive that we must needs attend to them. They offer themselves with irresistible *abandon* as a subject for the facile pen. In consequence, they have been exploited by the sentimentalists whose books are labelled *sweet*, by the humourists whose books are labelled *charming*, and by the poor creatures who try to be *funny*. The last have the lightest task, for nothing is easier to produce than Master Malaprop. And none of these writers should miss their public. We all wish to be sweetened, charmed, and made to laugh.

This brings us to our second point—why, if the prevalent taste for the Nursery be so natural, was it not satisfied before? Our answer to this question would be that in olden time children were not allowed sufficient freedom in the presence of their elders in order to display their own proper loveliness. In the earlier Middle Ages, no doubt, they had much freedom, but then there was but little literature. As time crept on, the belief that 'all virtues are closed in courtesy and all vices in villany' became crystallized in a code of manners, quite artificial and very precise. When such manners made men or marred them, children were at a disadvantage. All spontaneity was discouraged, and they had not lived long enough to find in art second nature. Good Master Russell and others very properly wished to impress their charges

'With a sense of the weight of the word "behave"';

but children are not most attractive when repeating lessons.

With the Tudors came despotism, and the spirit of tyranny permeated every department of life. Anyone who

reads Ascham's account of what Lady Jane Grey had to suffer from her odious parents will understand why children did not 'shew off' in those days. No doubt there were exceptions even then, and some children were indulged; but a king's favourite, a favourite slave and a favourite child, and all others allowed privileges through partiality denied to their degree, incur the odium of mankind. 'A favourite has no friends,' says Gray; and 'My Lady's eldest son, evermore tattling,' was no exception to this rule.

Then came Puritanism with other reasons for suppressing children. Puritans were more preoccupied with original sin than with actual transgressions; and as they did not much believe in sacramental grace they whipped the offending Adam out of children. High spirits were a sign of the devil's possession—what was joyous was dangerous to morals, and demonstrativeness had something of the nature of sin. John Wesley's mother was an admirable matron who brought up a large family on small means. She treated boys and girls alike; and 'when turned a year old (and some before) they were taught to fear the rod and *to cry softly*.'

Children then, no doubt, were quite as happy as they are now, but they did not lend themselves to literary treatment. Children then, as now, laughed and played, quarrelled and fought, got into mischief, cultivated their gift for wonder, and aspired to heroism. But they did all these things, so far as possible, by themselves out of the way. In the presence of their elders they were stiff and prim; they knew it was for them to stand and wait; they spoke when they were spoken to, said 'Sir' and 'Madam,' did as they were told directly, or were promptly disciplined with the birch.

We have grown more tender-hearted in these latter days. We may have grown wiser; we have certainly grown more careless as to how our little ones behave. Our grandfathers, if they were too pompous to treat their children as playmates, at least never regarded them as playthings. They strove to mould and fashion miniature men and women, and were at most tolerant of a childishness soon

to be outgrown. Chesterfield, writing from Babiole to his grandson, and the author of *The Edifying History of Miss Jemima Meek*, had this in common; they were solicitous about the future. Neither regretted nursery days, neither thought of infancy with delight. Both were compassionate in their endeavours to shew the way how to escape from childishness.

But if children did not provide materials for literature, they had their own books. Chapmen carried in their packs the sanguinary stories of *Jack the Giant Killer* and *Jack and the Bean Stalk*. There were many other 'wild tales' approved of by Charles Lamb. Richard Johnson was successful with his *Seven Champions*, and the charming book prepared at Little Gidding was not successful. It has only been unearthed and reprinted in these latter days. Perault's tales made their way into England, and children appropriated to themselves *Pilgrim's Progress*, *Robinson Crusoe*, and *Gulliver's Travels*, which had not been intended for them.

As the eighteenth century advanced Mr. Newbery began to tempt 'little masters and misses' to improve their naughty ways by little books adorned with gilt and Dutch paper. He also cared for the health of their bodies, and sold 'Dr. James's Powders' and other patent medicines. He had a tradesman's eye to his own profits, and the stories puffed his remedies not without humour. 'He was the honestest man in creation,' said Dr. Goldsmith; and he throve upon morality and purges. His tales shew the kindliness that resorts to masking powder in jam; and his readers must have been greedy of jam to stand such an intolerable deal of powder. It was a moral age, or rather an age of moralizing. Omniscient parents with a gift for exposition answer at length children with a passion for information; pattern parents inflict salutary punishments with awful warnings that the said punishments may be repeated and prolonged in another world. And yet these little books were popular—the wicked children especially so. The small reader is a censorious person with an appetite for exemplary justice where he is not personally concerned.

He is like Tom Tulliver, who 'was particularly clear on one point—namely, that he would punish everybody who deserved it: why, he wouldn't have minded being punished himself, if he deserved it; but then, he never *did* deserve it.'

The nineteenth century began with a belief in enlightenment. The day had come for 'the learned friend.' Children suffered from him, as well as their elders, and Coleridge quizzes

'the numberless writers of the small but luminous works on arts, trades and sciences, natural history and astronomy, all for the use of children from three years old to seven, interwoven with their own little biographies and nursery journals, to the exclusion of *Goody Two Shoes*, as favouring superstition by one party, and of *Jack the Giant Killer* as a suspicious parody on David and Goliath by the other.

'Far, far beyond, where'er my eyeballs stray,
By Lucifer! 'tis all one *milky way*!'

Charles Lamb and Sir Walter Scott agreed in abominating this literature. The former preferred 'wild tales' and the latter Border ballads. When it came to instruction, Sir Walter writes: 'Your ordinary Harry should be kept to his grammar, and your Lucy of most common occurrence will be best employed upon the sampler, instead of wasting wood and cutting their fingers, which I am convinced they did, though their historian says nothing of it.' Again he says: 'There is no great use in teaching children in general to roof houses or build bridges, which, after all, a carpenter or mason does a great deal better at two-and-sixpence a day.'

These remarks were made in criticizing Miss Edgeworth's story of *Harry and Lucy*, and they would be pertinent to many works that have since appeared. But Sir Walter had a proper regard for Miss Edgeworth's talents. She was so very clever, and 'best in the little touches too.' Her *Simple Susan* made him cry.

Miss Edgeworth is, in fact, not merely the first among many who wrote Moral Tales, but she is the first in time

among writers of fiction who diligently studied child life. A moralist in grain, she understood that the young might be overbored with good advice, and she made Lady Di Chillingworth a terrible example. She was also a born story-teller, with great gifts for constructing plots which should illustrate the lesson she wished to convey. *Waste not, want not*, for instance, is an admirable tale, and its copybook heading is all that is wanting to save a small boy from believing that with a pennyworth of whipcord he would be made for life. How admirable, too, in the same tale, is Hal—a thorough boy with all a boy's failings duly emphasized. Miss Edgeworth disapproves of him, but disapproves with complete understanding. One who observed so accurately and understood so clearly must have had more sympathy with childish faults than she chose to confess. She had, moreover, a sense of humour that is not to be disguised beneath her formal seriousness, and a moralist with a sense of humour is in touch with humanity.

The morality of Miss Edgeworth was in time to give place to the piety of Evangelical writers. Of these Mrs. Sherwood is easily first. *The Fairchild Family* is a classic. It may be too old-fashioned to appeal to the modern child, but it is a work which grown-up people can re-read with pleasure and profit.

And yet Mrs. Sherwood was not, like Miss Edgeworth, a literary woman. She did not sit down and construct a tale to illustrate a moral or further a theological system. She was just a good woman who looked into her own heart and wrote whatever came into her head. She writes so well because she is so natural. She had a wonderful gift for narrative, and can interest us in the veriest trifles, perhaps because they were not trifles to her. She enjoyed a wider popularity among children than Miss Edgeworth ever had. Miss Edgeworth had studied child life as material for literature. Mrs. Sherwood was a mother only anxious to instruct the children whom she loved.

The stories are told from a mother's point of view. No doubt episodes from her own childhood appear in them, but she is not intent upon interpreting her part; she

is anxious for the future of others. She knows children as they are, and she knows how troublesome and how unpleasant they can be. She knows that in the best regulated families children will manifest many evil tendencies; she allows for bad days, and a propensity to romp.

She is quite truthful. Henry steals an apple. He finally repents, but we are told what part fear played in his repentance. Henry has a new story-book. There is a picture of a funeral. 'Oh, how pretty!' says the delighted boy. The children read a story aloud; and as Emily turns a leaf Henry says: 'I know what is coming next; but do make haste, Emily!' Miss Darwell, the rich little girl, offers Henry her Noah's ark, but the children know that they must not receive presents in this way without their mother's consent. Miss Darwell hopes that she will remember to ask Mrs. Fairchild, but confesses that in the bustle of her birthday party she may forget. 'Shall I tell you of it?' says Henry. Henry does not think much of girls in a general way, but in company he is prepared to uphold his sister. 'Emily knows thousands upon thousands of games.' The grandmother Fairchild arrives on a visit. She is to be wheeled about in a chair, and Henry hopes for the honour of being chairman. His first question, in consequence, to the perplexed old lady is: 'May I be your horse?' These and a hundred other little touches shew how thoroughly Mrs. Sherwood is at home in the nursery, and how well she loves the place. When Mrs. Fairchild gives up going to the party because Miss Bessy has ruined her frock and cannot go; when she sets to work, and, what is better, sets Bessy to work to repair the damage; when she does not lecture or scold the careless but heartbroken little girl, we are conscious that we are dealing with a better woman than many of the frivolous writers who find mere amusement in the scrapes of children.

Most bachelors and old maids will put down *The Fairchild Family* with a wish that they could ask Emily, Lucy, and Harry to stay with them. They would love to spoil them. Parents, on the other hand, at the present day

will scarcely bring up their children in order to give uncles and aunts that pleasure.

We may pass over *The Wide Wide World*, a book that Bishop Thirlwall could not read, and we would not willingly read again, and pass on to Mrs. Ewing. If the Evangelical Movement produced Mrs. Sherwood, the Tractarian Revival is responsible for Mrs. Ewing. She, like Mrs. Sherwood, was devoted to children, but her outlook was different. She thinks of them always as children of God, and is not in consequence so impressed with the fact that they were born in sin. Both women loved children, both understood them, but one thought first of their faults and how they might be corrected ; the other thought first of their innocence and their charm. The one thinks of the future of the children themselves ; the other thinks of their influence upon grown-up people. Mrs. Ewing has probably never been so popular in the nursery as Mrs. Sherwood once was ; but she has had far more influence on the world outside, and it has been an influence from which children have benefitted.

Mrs. Sherwood could never have written *Daddy Darwin's Dovecot* or *Jan of the Windmill*. She was charitable to the poor, she inculcated charity, but her little masters and misses were kept from the contamination of rude children. The outlook of Mrs. Ewing was wider, her sympathies were not so narrow, she had no class prejudices. She was, moreover, an educationalist with theories. She has done much for the sensible treatment of little girls. Her *Six to Sixteen* is in truth an educational treatise. She made no silly distinctions as to sex ; she wanted boys to be pure and girls to be brave.

'In good sooth' (she writes), 'a young maid is all the better for learning some robuster virtues than maidenliness and not to move the antimacassars. And the robuster virtues require some fresh air and freedom. As, on the other hand, Jackanapes (who had a boy's full share of the little beast and the young monkey in his natural composition) was none the worse at his tender years, for learning some maidenliness—so far as maidenliness means decency, pity, unselfishness and pretty behaviour.'

Mrs. Ewing saw people's better qualities without ignoring

the bad. She is tender, almost playful, in dealing with frailties which would have shocked Mrs. Sherwood exceedingly. We cannot imagine Mrs. Sherwood writing: 'He was obedient; that is, he did what his great-aunt told him. But—oh dear! oh dear!—the pranks he played which it had never entered into her head to forbid!'

Mrs. Sherwood was not successful in drawing grown-up people. Her books concern the children. Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild had apparently little to do beyond instructing and correcting their offspring. But, for Mrs. Ewing, the home was the centre in which parents and older people held their rightful place, and had their own concerns to attend to. Moreover, she attempts to interpret life truthfully; whereas Mrs. Sherwood is truthful only in the delineation of character. Wishing to persuade children to walk in the paths of righteousness, Mrs. Sherwood shews an inevitable Nemesis pursuing the wrong-doer with a punishment to fit the crime. Mrs. Ewing knows that the wicked often flourish; but she would teach that there are things 'which are beyond all calculation of worldly goods and uses: things such as Love and Honour and the Soul of Man, which cannot be bought with a price, and which do not die with death. And they who fain would live happily *ever* after, should not leave these things out of the lessons of their lives.'

Mrs. Ewing attempted to depict life, but she was not always successful. She never quite learnt her limitations. In *We and the World* she went to sea and got altogether out of her depth; while *A Great Emergency* has been spoilt for many a boy by her feminine inability to understand cricket. Sometimes, too, her tales are so long that she seems to have tired of them herself. Even *Jan of the Windmill* tails off terribly, though the early scenes at the Mill and the description of the Nurse-boy are as good as anything written by George Eliot and more attractive. Mrs. Ewing, however, will live as the author of *Jackanapes* and *Daddy Darwin's Dovecot*. From an artistic point of view they are faultless. They are two of the best short stories in the English language.

Mrs. Ewing also wrote *The Story of a Short Life*, which

proved the most popular of her works. It was very pathetic without being mawkish, but it pandered somewhat to the sentimental. Its success encouraged inferior writers to gush about children and to wallow in pathetic situations. The literature about little boys seemed doomed to be drowned in floods of tears, while their admirers chanted elegies full of superfluous adjectives.

From this we were saved by Mr. Kenneth Grahame. His book, *The Golden Age*, reveals new possibilities in the nursery and a new interest in the child. We are carried clean out of the commonplace world of experience and introduced to a small republic composed of children who appreciate *Morte D'Arthur*, and copy Ulysses; who despise the spirit of the age and criticize with humour the conventions of life. And it is all done so naturally that as we read we are convinced. We accept the child in white socks, who writes in a style too good to be called 'precious,' who has 'not reached the disagreeable age when one develops a conscience,' but who is responsive to the voice of Nature, crafty like the beasts who burrow, whose dreams are to be compared with Sagas, and who, with a malevolence far from innocent, can reduce a curate and a lover to confusion. As we read, it seems all quite true; when we reflect, it is a wonderful exhibition of art. How was it done? we ask; but before answering that question let us acknowledge our indebtedness to Mr. Henley who discovered the man who could do it.

Mr. Grahame has set out to interpret the child from within. By an effort of the imagination he has gone back to a time when he was liable to be put in the corner, or held reversed in the air and smacked. Just as a small boy waves a tin sword as he sits a rocking horse while he imagines himself leading a forlorn hope through a hail of bullets; so Mr. Grahame at a desk with a grey goose quill, writing the language of the very *élite*, imagines himself in a sailor suit at war with the Olympians, his elders.

He has listened to the almost inarticulate utterances of children, translated and interpreted them. He has watched their play, their seeming inconsequence, their

pretences; and he has divined the meaning. He has memories of that far-off time coloured indeed by the reflections of a later age. He has views about the world as it is, and his humour is to test them from the child's standpoint. He tries to see life as it must appear to a child with his limited experience; and the result is criticism both shrewd and amusing.

But children, though they must very largely live in a world by themselves, have to depend on their elders for other things than the material necessities of life. They are never quite so independent as Mr. Grahame represents them. They have, for instance, a terrible craving to be loved. Neither is it true to suppose that conscience as a rule is a late development. A child has more time to think of conduct than his busy elders. He acts on impulse, but he is inclined to be morbid in his repentance; and he thinks like a judge, especially about the sins of others. Most parents know that one of their great difficulties is the casuistical mind of small offenders; and that is why parents give up reasoning with their children and punish. Again, though we admit to the full all that Mr. Grahame has to teach us about the mental activity and imaginative power of children, we know that few are as purposeful as those in *The Golden Age*. Their adventures are unfinished, their wit lies in sallies, their dreams and romances never come to an end. However, the artist does not copy Nature. His business is to select, to compose, to concentrate what is dissipated, to preserve the essentials; and this Mr. Grahame has done. Lastly, these delightful sketches are like the author's other work in so far as they are 'Pagan Papers.' His children have never 'felt God a moment'; and perhaps for that reason they remain unrelated to the life that we know.

Mr. Pater's *Child in the Home* is frankly an effort of memory and reflection. All grown-up people know how certain incidents, scenes, colours, and words have in childhood been stamped upon the mind, but few have been able to describe them with the same delicate precision. To be so careful of past experience is the splendid economy of the

great artist who does not care to mirror the moment, but reflects the impressions only that time cannot efface. Mr. Kenneth Grahame interprets the child from within, Mr. Pater interprets one child—himself; but it is Mr. Stevenson who has best preserved the child-like spirit. He at least never quite grew up.

A Child's Garden of Verses is indeed the greatest achievement from this point of view. It reads as if it might have been written by a boy aged eight. The language, the imagination, the reasoning are alike childlike. The very rhythm seems attuned to little feet that patter and trip. The verses sound best when recited by a clear treble. Even the morals are adapted to the nursery. They are as juvenile as Mrs. Sherwood's *Cautionary Verses*, but what a different spirit they display!

> 'A child should always say what's true,
> And speak when he is spoken to,
> And behave mannerly at table;
> At least as far as he is able.'

Mrs. Sherwood's code did not admit of excuses.

If Mr. Stevenson is most childlike, Mr. Barrie is the most accurate observer of children. *The Little White Bird* is full of humour and kindly sentiment. We should like to visit Kensington Gardens and be introduced to the author's little friends, at any rate when they are not 'Mary-Annish' or 'mad dog.' How truthful is his report of the place. For instance:

> 'Between the well and the Round Pond are the cricket-pitches, and frequently the choosing of sides exhausts so much time that there is scarcely any cricket. Everybody wants to bat first, and as soon as he is out he bowls, unless you are the better wrestler, and while you are wrestling with him the fielders have scattered to play at something else.'

That appeals to all who have tried to arrange games for children. Either they all want to do the same thing at the same time, or their desires are too diverse to allow them to play at one game. They also sometimes forget what they

are playing at, which is very annoying to their elders, but oh ! so natural !

Mr. Barrie has indeed shewn how a real intimacy can exist between a man and a little boy. Mr. Kenneth Grahame's hero despised his elders as self-satisfied 'Olympians.' If Mr. Barrie be an 'Olympian,' he is very humble. He knows how much and how little can be expected from a child's sympathy. He is content to lavish his affection and glad to receive any response that is vouchsafed. He is a man and his little friend is going to be one, and herein lies the pathos of the tale. The man sees the shadow of Pilkington all over the garden and knows what it forebodes. The boy looks forward to Pilkington's. He is manly and would be more so. His friend would not have it otherwise, though for him it means loss. Some men love children and some only childhood. Now the love for a child may grow with his growth, but the love of childhood, finding its opportunity in a child, is doomed. The boy puts his hands in his pockets and goes whistling off to a Private School. A child he will be no more.

In *The Noisy Years*, Mrs. Dearmer deals with a similar problem. How is a young mother to live on terms with two little monkeys in a small flat ? Mr. Barrie's experiences were all out of doors, and after all he was not responsible. Mrs. Dearmer's mother lives at home, and bears up under her responsibilities as best she may. She is very successful: she can see the amusing side of much that is inconvenient and can laugh through her tears, a purely feminine virtue. Her little boys are as charming as their mother, and we would ask Mr. Kenneth Grahame to study the conscience of Robin. It is well worth the trouble.

We should also like to introduce to the family in *The Golden Age* the Bastable children, who appear in two volumes by Mrs. Nesbit, *Oswald Bastable* and *The Treasure Seekers*. They might not have agreed very well; and it is even possible that they might have destroyed one another. And yet Mrs. Nesbit has great gifts in dealing with children. She can forgive their noisy and assertive ways. She can record without comment their actions. In fact, she puts their

adventures into the mouth of Oswald Bastable—a voluble young gentleman entirely self-satisfied, with an irritating habit of talking of himself in the third person. He writes as a boy for boys; and boys are likely to appreciate him. He belongs not to an ancient home with Blue Rooms and deserted boudoirs: Oswald Bastable thrives in the suburbs, and is not much given to dreaming. His energy never tires; his very morality is assertive. He and his brothers and sisters are all of them fresh, and healthy with a super-abundance of life. Their adventures merit narration, but we sometimes suspect the truthful Oswald of exaggerating just a little, as boys will. And Oswald's attitude towards his elders is interesting. It is that of the modern child. What Mrs. Sherwood would have thought of it we tremble to imagine; but here in black and white is his testimonial to the virtues of Mrs. Bax.

'We had only discovered her true nature three days ago, and already she had taken us out in a sailing-boat and in a motor car, had given us sweets every day, and taught us eleven new games that we had not known before; and only four of the new games were rotten. How seldom can as much be said for the games of a grown-up, however gifted! . . . There are points about having a grown-up with you if it is of the right kind. You can then easily get it to say "yes" to what you want, and after that if anything goes wrong it is their fault, and you are pure from blame.'

Grown-ups like to read about Oswald, but few would care to invite the Bastables on a lengthy visit. The prudent man would ask the Fairchild Family to stay with him, and the Bastables to meet them for one afternoon with the children out of *The Golden Age*. Then he would take the nameless hero of Mr. Kenneth Grahame for a walk on the Roman Road and discuss life until it was imperative to return and pick up the bits. The modern child can be very exacting and selfish; and he is not always quite so high-minded as Oswald Bastable reports himself as being.

In Mrs. Allen Harker's books we are glad to find ourselves once more in a home with wholesome nursery discipline. *The Romance of a Nursery* and *Concerning Paul and Fiam-*

metta, both deal with the same family, dwelling amid the Cotswolds in 'a haunt of ancient peace.' The former tale is spoilt by a melodramatic close; but the latter is quite delightful. Modern children are again represented—happy children always getting into and out of scrapes, but they are civilized. In these tales, too, we find a father who does not lecture but is always ready to help; a mother who does not fuss but does control; and a home that is beautiful and charming as the life which is there enjoyed. The stories are put into the mouth of Janey, 'a ripping girl,' as her brother calls her. She lives the outdoor life, she cultivates the robuster virtues, she would even learn to box; but we never forget she is a maiden, and a very sweet little maiden too.

Fiammetta, on the other hand, is the only child of a Poet who lives a Bohemian life. She has been brought up in a variety of foreign hotels; she has the artistic temperament; and the stories relate to a long visit that she pays to the home of her cousins. Of course, Fiammetta is charming, of course she attracts attention, but her little friend who keeps herself in the background is the child we would know more about.

It would be interesting to compare what we have learnt from these many and very varied writers, to note where Mrs. Sherwood is corroborated by Mr. Barrie, and Mr. Stevenson and Mrs. Harker disagree. For that we have no space, but after the old fashion of children's books we would draw a moral at the close. A century ago parents regarded children as potential men and women and were a little too eager to force their development. Nowadays children are regarded as charming, everyone is kind to them, everyone is tolerant, but we tend to forget that they have a future, and that childhood passes away.

To study childhood is one thing, to train a child quite another, and children need to be trained, and were not merely intended for our amusement. The first years of life are indeed most important. 'Give me a child up to seven, and I care not who has him afterwards,' said a saga-

cious Jesuit. After reading many of these children's books the necessity of enforcing parental responsibility becomes apparent. We do not want mechanical morals; we do not want primness and suppression. We do want homes like those described by Mrs. Ewing and Mrs. Allen Harker.

Art. VIII.—THE NEW THEOLOGY.

1. *The New Theology.* By R. J. Campbell, M.A., Minister of the City Temple, London. Fifth Impression. (London : Chapman & Hall, Limited, 1907.)
2. *What about the New Theology?* By W. L. Walker. (Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark, 1907.)
3. *The British Weekly.* Art. *The Newest Theology.* By P. T. Forsyth, D.D., March 7, 1907. Art. *The New Theology*, March 21, 1907. Art. *God, Sin and the Atonement*, March 28, 1907. Art. *Pantheism and the Churches*, April 4, 1907. (London : Hodder & Stoughton.)

Every thoughtful person will recognize that, while the Christian Creed is always the same, Christian theology is always changing. This is right and natural. The Christian Creed enshrines a Divine revelation. It tells us of knowledge given to man of that which transcends experience, and it is held to-day, as it always has been, with an unanimity that is remarkable. It is the fashion to be dwelling continually on the divisions of Christians and the differences of opinion which prevail. Those who do so seem to forget that substantially on the great subject of the contents of the Creed all existing bodies of Christians are at one. All alike—Roman, Orthodox, Anglican, Protestant, so long as they claim to be orthodox—can express their belief in the terms of the Creed promulgated at Chalcedon. But while the Christian belief is and always has been one, Christian theology is infinitely varied, because it is the interpretation of that belief in human language, in the language adapted to each age and country. The thought of Athanasius was very different from that of Augustine. East and West

think very differently. The man brought up on the scholastic philosophy cannot express his ideas in the same way as the pupil of Darwin. To each the Creed must be interpreted in a way that he can understand. More than that, each will have something to give to the comprehension of the Christian faith. We know more of what Christianity means each time a new system of philosophy comes to assist in interpreting it.

When, then, we are told of a 'New Theology,' although our remembrance of the humble spirit of the greatest theologians will make us resent the title, we do not consider it necessary to condemn it beforehand. If theology were not always becoming new the Christian Church would be failing in its work. We recognize that in the face of the problems of the present day old truths require restatement. Science, evolution, psychology, Biblical criticism, all raise questions which demand an answer. Nor, again, are we especially enamoured of a great deal of the theology of the Reformation. We certainly hold no brief for the particular religious opinions against which Mr. Campbell's teaching is a protest; hence we do not approach the examination of his new doctrines with any feeling of prejudice. That anyone should revolt against a great deal of the traditional teaching of the City Temple seems to us an entirely healthy sign. We are therefore anxious to consider what he has to say, certainly without prejudice, and perhaps with some feelings of sympathy. But we are afraid that the result of our reading has been to change our sympathy into protest. We have seldom read a theological work which professed to be part of a revolution of religious thought which has been to us more repellent. We do not quarrel with Mr. Campbell so much because he has the tricks of the popular preacher, because he is strangely ignorant both of theology and philosophy—a state of mind which is not uncommon among those who profess to be leaders of thought. That he despises what he does not know is equally natural. We might pardon all these things, but we cannot pardon—and we say it with the utmost seriousness—the irreverent parodies of popular religious thought that disfigure the work.

They are as futile from the point of view of argument as they are unworthy of serious theology. It is quite easy to make any form of opinion appear to look ridiculous by stating it in a ridiculous way. It shocks every reverent mind, and it does not help the cause of truth. So strongly do we feel this that we should in many ways have been inclined to pass the book over in complete silence, but it is clear that the difficulties which have caused Mr. Campbell to build up what seems to us so inadequate a theology are felt probably in just the same crude form by many other persons, and we think that it may be useful to try not so much to criticize Mr. Campbell—for that has, we think, been done sufficiently—as to attempt to unravel these difficulties. We shall therefore banish as much as possible from our minds the defects of the work, and address ourselves to the different questions which Mr. Campbell raises.

I.

The main purpose of *The New Theology* is described in the following words :

'What is wanted is a restatement of the essential truth of the Christian religion in terms of the modern mind. Where or when the name New Theology arose I do not know, but it has been in existence for at least one generation. . . . It has long been in use . . . to indicate the attitude of those who believe that the fundamentals of the Christian faith need to be rearticulated in terms of the immanence of God.'

Certain intellectual difficulties have, in the opinion of Mr. Campbell, made this necessary. He is defining the meaning of God, and he writes as follows :

'So far science has only succeeded in giving us a vaster, grander conception of God, by giving us a vaster, grander conception of the universe in which we live. When I say God, I mean the mysterious Power which is finding expression in the universe, and which is present in every tiniest atom of the wondrous whole. I find that this Power is the one reality I cannot get away from, for, whatever else it may be, it is myself. Theologians will tell me that I have taken a prodigious leap

in saying this, but I cannot help it. How can there be anything in the universe outside of God? Whatever distinctions of being there may be within the universe, it is surely clear that they must all be transcended and comprehended within infinity. There cannot be two infinities, nor can there be an infinite and also a finite beyond it. What infinity may be we have no means of knowing. Here the most devout Christian is just as much of an agnostic as Professor Huxley; we can predicate nothing with confidence concerning the all-comprehending unity wherein we live and move and have our being, save and except as we see it manifested in that part of our universe which lies open to us. One would think that this were so obvious as to need no demonstration. But how do ordinary church-going Christians talk about God? They talk as though He were (practically) a finite being, stationed somewhere above and beyond the universe, watching and worrying over other and lesser finite beings—to wit, ourselves. According to the received phraseology, this God is greatly bothered and thwarted by what men have been doing throughout the few millenniums of human existence. He takes the whole thing very seriously, and thinks about little else than getting wayward humanity into line again. To this end He has adopted various expedients, the chief of which was the sending of His only-begotten Son to suffer and die in order that He might be free to forgive the trouble we had caused Him.'

We have quoted this passage because it is thoroughly characteristic both of the style and of the confusion of thought of the writer. It is very interesting to find ourselves back again in the old difficulties of the Gnostic. How can the Infinite become finite? How can God, who is all, create anything? This is the old question which perplexed so many dreamers in the second century, and produced those wonderful systems of speculative Gnosticism which have very much in common with Mr. Campbell's theology—systems which were really attempts, just as his is, to express Christianity in the terms of Divine immanence. But Mr. Campbell and the Gnostics alike have fallen into the fashion of arguing from words as if they understood what they meant. He says quite rightly that we have no means of knowing what infinity is. If that be the case

how can we argue about what the Infinite God can or cannot do? That is the whole root of the difficulty. Every mathematician knows that if you introduce infinity into a problem you can arrive at very strange results. So it is in language. We call God Infinite[1] because we have no other way of expressing what we mean, but, as Mr. Campbell himself says, we do not know what infinity means. We can only think of it as unlimited, and it is just as hard for us to think of the unlimited as it is to think of the limited. As has been well put, the infinite is only a concept of the mind. Mr. Campbell, like many other thinkers, has argued about it as if it represented a reality. When we deny the possibility of God having created the universe because we cannot understand how the Infinite became finite we are simply limiting the Divine power by our own mental conceptions. It would be more correct to say not that God is unlimited, but that He is self-limited. The whole question is discussed, we think, very well by Dr. Strong.

'The question of infinity is more serious. It seems to involve a real limitation upon the infinity of God, that He should fix definite laws for created existence and allow a thought to take shape, as it were, outside Himself in an independent fashion. . . .

'It is true, that if the desire arose from without, and was caused, as in the case of men, by some change occurring independently of the subject of it, such a position would be in contradiction with the idea of Infinity. But it is quite different if the desire depends solely upon the will of the Infinite, and if the realization of it, even though it may involve limitation, is self-chosen. It is quite possible that Creation may mean in some sense a self-limitation on the part of God, though we cannot fully understand in what sense. But it will be remembered that in the last chapter we quoted an ancient doctrine mentioned by St. Irenæus, that the nature of God is self-limiting; the Father, writes St. Irenæus, is unmeasured, the Son is the measure of the Father. And we cannot but think that this thought is far truer, we believe, and more suitable to the notion

[1] It may be noticed that the Anglican Articles (in which the language is carefully chosen) do not speak of God as 'infinite,' but as 'of infinite power, wisdom and goodness'—which is a very different thing.

of God than the popular epithet infinite. This word is purely negative in its associations; it means literally nothing but the absence of all limits. And there is nothing in it to show that it does not include the absence of all positive existence. . . .

'What we desire to affirm is, that neither finite nor infinite has any proper meaning apart from the idea of quantity, and that this is out of place in speaking of personal life. On the other hand, the idea of self-limitation has none of the disadvantages of these two terms, finite and infinite. It is applicable to a personal being, and all the meaning it has is permeated through and through with the notion of personality. It may be employed with reference to any act in which a personal being decisively expresses himself, and it wholly avoids the contradiction between definite action and the so-called infinity of the Divine Being. It is exactly the expression best suited for describing action, and in the present application of it, it shows us Creation as in harmony with the revealed nature of God.'[1]

Mr. Campbell's difficulties, then, like those of many others, have come, we believe, from his first saying that God is Infinite, a word which has no real relation to things and only expresses the limitation of our intellect, and then limiting His power by the epithet he has given Him. Surely it is wiser to keep the old term 'Almighty.' To deny that God can create new things is to limit His power. Grant Him to be Almighty, All-powerful, and this limitation is obviously a contradiction. Between All-powerful and Infinite let Mr. Campbell choose—for choose he must—which is the Christian conception admits of no doubt.

But Mr. Campbell's differs from the Christian conception in another and a deeper way. His conception of God is not the Christian conception: it is a Greek conception, a philosophic conception; it is one which gives another name to the 'unconscious force' of the materialist; but the very essence of the Christian conception is that God is personal. Its root is the Hebrew conception of 'Jehovah, exalted in righteousness.' The Christian believes in a personal and a moral God, not an unmoral

[1] *A Manual of Theology*, by T. B. Strong, D.D., Dean of Christ Church, Oxford. Second edition, pp. 192–194 (A. & C. Black, 1903).

force. That all such language is of course difficult, that it is inadequate, we recognize; that the term personal can only be explained by human analogy and represents but a part of the truth, all this we admit. But the essence of the whole Christian revelation as regards the nature of the Godhead begins with the belief that God is our Father. This, according to Professor Harnack, was the great truth which our Lord came to reveal to us, this is the dogma behind the simplest prayer of the little child, without this thought religion has no meaning. And it is just because, in the words which we have quoted, Mr. Campbell implicitly denies the Fatherhood of God that the whole of his superstructure is valueless. It is because, as Christ has revealed to us, God does care for a man and '*is bothered*' about man (if we may repeat these very irreverent words) that we pray to Him, that we worship Him, that we love Him. What does our Lord say?

'Behold the birds of the heaven, that they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; and your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are not ye of much more value than they?'

'Why are ye anxious concerning raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. But if God doth so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall He not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?'

'Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father: but the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not therefore; ye are of more value than many sparrows.'

II.

We pass on to ask what is the relation of man to God? And here we find Mr. Campbell somewhat frightened of pursuing the course on which he has started to its logical conclusion. We do not blame him for this. We think that if he had done so his theology and philosophy would be worse than it is, but our difficulty is that he seems to

try to get all the credit of being a consistent Monist and yet to deny the accusation. This is what he writes :

'The ultimate Self of the universe is God. The New Testament speaks of man as body, soul, and spirit. The body is the thought-form through which the individuality finds expression on our present limited plane ; the soul is a man's consciousness of himself as apart from all the rest of existence, and even from God—it is the bay seeing itself as the bay, and not as the ocean ; the spirit is the true being thus limited and expressed —it is the deathless Divine within us. The soul, therefore, is what we make it ; the spirit we can neither make nor mar, for it is at once our being and God's. What we are here to do is to grow the soul—that is, to manifest the true nature of the spirit, to build up that self-realization which is God's objective with the universe as a whole, and with every self-conscious unit in particular.

'Where, then, someone will say, is the dividing line between our being and God's ? There is no dividing line except from our side. . . . But, the reader may protest, this is Pantheism. No, it is not. "Pantheism" is a technical term in philosophic parlance, and means something quite different from this. It stands for a Fate-God, a God imprisoned in His universe, a God who cannot help Himself, and does not even know what He is about, a blind force which here breaks out into a rock and there into Ruskin, and is equally indifferent to either. But that is not my God. My God is my deeper Self, and yours too ; He is the Self of the universe, and knows all about it. He is never baffled, and cannot be baffled ; the whole cosmic process is one long incarnation and uprising of the being of God from itself to itself. With Tennyson you can call this doctrine the Higher Pantheism, if you like ; but it is the very antithesis of the Pantheism which has played such a part in the history of thought.'

Now we quite admit that Mr. Campbell does not wish to teach Pantheism ; our difficulty is that we do not know how, starting with the premises that he does, he can save himself from such a conclusion. If we are God, God realizing Himself, and if everything good and evil is God, because there cannot be anything outside God, and if God is the force and power of the universe and is only expressed in the

universe, and if we are also a part of the universe—and all this Mr. Campbell, so far as we can see, asserts—those who have logically gone further and taught Pantheism in its complete form seem to us to be consistent thinkers, while Mr. Campbell is not. Throughout he tells us that he wishes to shew that Christianity is really moral, and not immoral as the old theology would make out, but he has in reality taken away the whole possibility of morality as it is commonly understood. He goes on to admit his want of logical consistency, for he says that you cannot defend free will logically, and yet somehow he feels that there must be room for something that would be free will. This shews that his logical conclusion is unsound; does it not suggest to him that his premises are insufficient?

Let us try and state the lines on which we believe that the solution should be attained. Science, law, Pantheism, whatever you will, are simply the interpretation of part of our experience, our experience of the external world; but we have another experience, far more real, far more true even than our knowledge of the external world—viz. our knowledge of ourself as a cause. The whole of human life and human thought, of society, of legislation, is based upon the idea that the individual is a free cause. There are two elements in the experience of every man, and no philosophy is adequate which does not recognize both. Our experience is double: the experience of our own consciousness, the Ego, and the experience of that outside our consciousness, the world. Any system which is true to life and provides a basis of life must be true to both those experiences. Christianity puts before us three great entities—the world, myself, and, as the explanation of both, God. It assumes the reality of each of them; it gives a reasonable hypothesis for both my life and my experience. It makes me a moral being, and therefore it forms a reasonable basis of conduct. Mr. Campbell's philosophy in which ultimate distinctions have disappeared, whether we call it Pantheism or, as he prefers it, a Monistic idealism, does not. He wishes, as we shall see, to establish a sound basis of moral action, but we fail ourselves to find it in his teaching.

III.

There is no part of Mr. Campbell's theory which has laid itself open to more criticism than his treatment of the problem of sin. Some of the criticism may not be quite fair to Mr. Campbell's own opinions, as passages have been quoted apart from their context. But if we save his character as a preacher, we can hardly preserve it as a philosopher. It will be most convenient to quote different views which he expresses.

'Evil is a negative, not a positive term. It denotes the absence rather than the presence of something. It is the perceived privation of good, the shadow where the light ought to be. "The devil is a vacuum," as a friend of mine once remarked to the no small bewilderment of a group of listeners, in whose imagination the devil was anything but a vacuum. Evil is not an intruder in an otherwise perfect universe; finiteness presumes it. A thing is only seen to be evil when the capacity for good is present and unsatisfied. Evil is not a principle at war with good. Good is being, and evil is not-being. When consciousness of being seeks further expression, and finds itself hindered by its limitations, it becomes aware of evil.'

Here then we have reminiscences of Plato, the Platonic theory of good as being, and evil as not-being. We pass to a second quotation:

'What you are seeking, young man, is more abundant life, and that is equivalent to seeking God. Life *is* God. "Every good and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights." And when the tendency goes round and works havoc and ruin in the world, it still remains a quest for God, although a blundering one. It is a misuse of Divine energy. The man who got drunk last night and gratified his lower nature in that delirious hour would be surprised if you were to tell him, when you see the result, that he was really seeking God; but so it is. He wants life, and thinks he can get it this way. This is the reason why morbid excitement and the craving for amusement have such power in human lives to-day. Your *roué* in Piccadilly, who went out to destroy innocence, was seeking life while spreading death. It seems

almost blasphemy to say it, but he was seeking God, and thinking —O woeful blunder!—that he would find Him by destroying something that God has made beautiful and fair.'

Here the Pantheist is speaking, and Mr. Campbell's reasoning is quite logical. If God is everything and if I am a part of God, then everything I do must be a part of Him, and it becomes difficult on any logical grounds to find a basis for any theory of sin. Now let us turn to a third quotation:

'It is time we had done with unreal talk about sin. Sin is the murder-spirit in human experience. "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer. If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" Strong language; but I suppose the man who first used it must have known what he was talking about. Pomposity is sin, because it is egoism; self-complacency and contemptuousness are sin for the same reason. Cupidity is sin, whether in a burglar or in a doctor of divinity. A bitter, grasping, cruel, unsympathetic spirit is sin, no matter who shows it. The scribe and the Pharisee are too much with us, and the religious ideal needs to be rescued from their blighting grasp to-day as much as ever it did. Of all forms of sin, an arrogant, malignant, self-satisfied assumption of righteousness is the worst and the hardest to eradicate.'

And so on. Here it is the Christian preacher who is speaking, and even though we do not consider that Mr. Campbell covers the whole of the ground when he tells us that sin is selfishness, we entirely concur with his denunciation of the love of self in every class and every society. But after we have passed all these three extracts in review (and they are each typical of things Mr. Campbell often says) we remain more than ever in difficulties as to what Mr. Campbell's theory of evil really is. Are we to take him as a Platonist and say that evil is not-being? Or are we to take him as a Pantheist and say that there is really no such thing as evil at all? Or are we to take him as a Christian teacher and listen to his eloquent denunciations of wickedness in the world? And if, as he tells us, the world is an experiment without the

risk of failure, how does it come about that whether in the world or in the Church there are such innumerable signs of failure, such terrible instances of incapacity to reach the ideal—that there is so much sin and misery and selfishness in the world? We venture to think that thoughtful persons will hardly feel that Mr. Campbell's 'New Theology' has made much advance in solving the problem of the universe.

Let us examine further some of the causes of Mr. Campbell's difficulties. Throughout, as one would expect, difficulties about the Fall assume a very prominent place. The whole Christian doctrine of sin, in his opinion, is the result of mistaken ideas about the Fall.

'The theological muddle is largely caused by the inability of many people to free themselves from archaic notions which have really nothing to do with Christianity, although they have been imported into it. The principal of these, in relation to the question of sin, is the doctrine of the Fall. This doctrine has played a mischievous part in Christian thought, more especially, perhaps, since the Reformation.'

Now we can quite understand that a reaction from teaching about 'total depravity' and such similar language may lead to very unfair and prejudiced criticism, but what Mr. Campbell, and so many critics like him, fail to see is that the fact of sin, and the whole Christian doctrine about sin and Atonement, are quite apart from and independent of any particular doctrine concerning the Fall. The theology of the Fall hardly appears in the Old Testament. It has left hardly any traces, if any at all, in the Gospels, and if anyone will read attentively the Epistle to the Romans he will see that there, too, the whole argument is entirely independent of the passage about the Fall. The basis of St. Paul's teaching is not the Fall of Man but the fact of sin: this he proves both objectively, by the state of the existing world at the time when he wrote, and subjectively by his personal and religious experience. Because a righteous God must feel wrath against sin, therefore salvation is necessary for mankind, and whether the story of the

Book of Genesis be a historical fact or an allegory that argument will still hold good. St. Paul's idea about the Fall only appears in two places, both very obscure, and the logical connexion with the rest of his doctrine is that the story of the Fall embodies a theory of the origin of sin. It does not explain sin, because sin is something that exists.

At the present time there is, and there is rightly, a reaction against some of the extremer forms of the Reformation doctrine. Both Biblical criticism and the study of ethnology make it impossible for most people to believe in the story of the Fall as a historical fact. A one-sided conception of the meaning of evolution makes a large number of people desire to construct a theory of life which shall have no place in it for any fall in man. But none of these changes in thought and none of these theories do away with the actual facts which have made people in the past believe in sin, and which led to such speculations as those concerning the origin of evil. No theory of evolution can explain away facts, and the fact is this—that man, so far as we can see, alone amongst created beings has the gift of conscious knowledge of right and wrong, the power of choosing right and rejecting wrong, and that he has often chosen the wrong and rejected the right. The result of this has been that state of mankind which we call sinful, which is attacked by so many preachers in such vigorous language, by none more so than by Mr. Campbell. There may have been—probably there is—exaggeration in the Christian language and the Christian preaching, as there is in the language of the Stoic philosopher. It is possible to take a perverted view of the condition of mankind; but the fact remains that this phenomenon which we call sin, this failure to attain the ideal, is a characteristic of human life, and no philosophy which fails to take it into account is in the least adequate as a theory of the universe. And our knowledge about sin is not confined to what we see. It is a fact of our own personal experience. We know that we have a conscience which tells us what is right and what is wrong. We know that we can blur and destroy that conscience as we can blur and destroy other gifts. We know that we

constantly think and desire to do what is clearly, as our conscience tells, not right: that there is a struggle and that, unless we are victorious in this struggle, the tendency to do wrong will increase. We feel that we are ourselves in revolt against something which is higher; that if we have an ideal it may very likely help us to do what is right. We inevitably put sin in antithesis to righteousness and to God. The theologians tell us that sin in its essence is a revolt against righteousness, which is God. Here, as elsewhere, no doubt we are using what the Dean of Westminster has called 'the language of necessarily imperfect symbolism,' but at any rate we feel that the Christian theory explains and accounts for the facts and forms a basis for a higher morality, that it has made possible the moral progress of the world. We feel that Mr. Campbell's theory affords no explanation of the facts of life, and no basis for the ethical teaching which, as he so constantly reminds us, is the only part of Christianity which is to him of any value.

IV.

We do not know that it is necessary for us to dwell at very great length on Mr. Campbell's theory about the Person of our Lord. Like so many teachers of his character he begins, as we expect, by a somewhat conventional eulogy of the Founder of Christianity, which is couched in that patronizing phraseology which seems to be popular.

> 'It is no use trying to place Jesus in a row along with other religious masters. He is first and the rest nowhere; we have no category for Him. I am not trying to prove the impossible, namely, that Christianity is the only true religion and the rest are all false. We shall get on better when that kind of nonsense ceases to be spoken.'

The rest of his discussion on this subject is devoted to reasserting the traditional language of Christianity with quite a different meaning, and the distinction between his teaching and the ordinary Christian doctrine is fundamental. Traditional Christianity, following the teaching

of St. Paul and the New Testament, tells us in Mr. Campbell's words that

'The second person in the Trinity, who was co-equal and co-eternal with God the Father, laid aside His glory, became incarnate for our salvation, was born of a virgin, lived a brief, suffering life, wrought many miracles, died a shameful death, rose again from the tomb on the second morning after He had been laid in it, and ascended into Heaven in full view of His wondering disciples.'

Of this and similar doctrines he tells us:

'There is a sense in which all this is true, but it is commonly expressed in such a way that the truth is lost sight of. Literally understood, it is incredible. The only way to get at the truth in every one of these venerable articles of the Christian faith will be to shed the husk, and that we must do without hesitation or compromise.'

A restatement of this doctrine begins by telling us that though we can speak of the Divinity of Christ we cannot speak of the Deity. Christ's personality was Divine because it was the one life which consistently and from first to last was lived in the terms of the whole, and therefore was Divine. But 'in a sense, everything that exists is Divine,' though 'it can hardly be seriously contended that a crocodile is as much an expression of God as General Booth.' 'General Booth is Divine in so far as love is the governing principle of his life. Jesus was Divine simply and solely because His life was never governed by any other principle.' 'The Jesus of history did not possess the consciousness of Deity during His life on earth. His consciousness was as purely human as our own.' According to theologians Christ 'assumed human nature, but He was eternally Divine before He did so,' and there is no need 'to refute this argument; the trend of modern thought is already doing so most effectually.' This 'is not Unitarianism,' because Unitarianism 'has been just as prone to dualism as the extremist Trinitarianism.' Christ is Divine because man is Divine.

Side by side with this definition of the Person of our

Lord, which makes Him represent the Divine in man, we have a further doctrine of the Eternal Christ. 'Jesus is the fullest expression of that eternal Divine man on the field of human history'; there is 'the archetypal eternal Divine Man, the source and sustenance of the universe, and yet transcending the universe.' 'The idea of a Divine Man, the emanation of the infinite, the Soul of the universe, the source and goal of all humanity, is ages older than Christian theology. . . . It is a true, indeed an inevitable, conception, if we hold anything like a consistent view of the immanence of God in His universe. With what God have we to do except the God who is eternally man?' This is 'the eternal Christ.' 'According to the New Testament writers Jesus was and is the Christ, but in His earthly life His consciousness of the fact was limited. But, as we have come forth from this fontal manhood, we too must be to some extent expressions of this eternal Christ. . . . Fundamentally our being is already one with that of the eternal Christ, and faith in Jesus is faith in Him.'

It hardly seems necessary to give more illustrations of Mr. Campbell's teaching. As we read his words we seem to hear strange reminiscences of teaching of long ago. We have already shewn how the problems that beset Mr. Campbell were the same problems as those of the Gnostics of old. It is the same in his doctrine of free will, the same in his difficulty with regard to the existence of evil, the same in his doctrine of the Person of Christ. Here we have just the separation of Jesus and the Christ which we find in Valentinus. Here again we have Christianity stated in the language of a decadent Pantheism.

We are quite sure that Mr. Campbell does not represent what the Church has taught, what the Bible teaches, or what we believe to be true; but we should like to ask one further question. Is what he teaches any easier for us to believe at the present day than what the Church teaches? Is it easier to believe in 'a Divine man, the emanation of the infinite, the Soul of the universe?' The language is unreal, mystical. It has no authority, it does not come to us with authority, it has no evidence

in its favour. It may attract a few minds, as Theosophy and mysticism always have attracted certain minds, but it is so unreal, so untrue to the facts of life and experience, with its perversion—we can call it nothing else—of Christianity that it will not be a Gospel for the age. Here, as elsewhere, Mr. Campbell has perverted and distorted Christian truth. Christianity has always taught us that Christ was God and the Son of God, and it was because He was God that He was able to reveal human nature in its ideal aspect; and so 'because He became man He made it possible that we should become God.' *Αὐτὸς ἐνηνθρώπησεν ἵνα ἡμεῖς θεοποιηθῶμεν*, as said Athanasius. We are able, we believe, to attain to what is the ideal and the goal of our nature, not merely because He is the same as we are, in that He has taken our nature upon Him, but because He is different from us. By that Divine nature of His He is able to represent humanity as it should be, not as it is. It does not help us to attain our ideal by protesting that humanity is what it is not.

V.

Mr. Campbell's treatment of the doctrine of the Atonement is very characteristic. He begins, as we might naturally expect, by a statement of the Christian doctrine of the Atonement similar in character to his statement concerning other Christian doctrines. It is needless to say that it is a caricature of what is taught. The conventional doctrine of the Atonement, as he calls it, is stripped of everything which makes it both ethical and real, and is then attacked for being un-ethical. But the crude view which is here imputed to theologians has never been taught by any theologian of any merit from the Reformation onwards. It is sometimes a fashion to criticize, and criticize severely, Luther's statements about the Atonement, not as Luther expounded them but as it is assumed that he expounded them. But it will be found that he never taught the doctrine in the crude way which is ascribed to him. What we often consider to be in him only forensic was corrected by a strong element of mysticism,

and he, as much as his critics at the present day, thought that the Atonement was not only done for us but done in us.

Further, Mr. Campbell wishes it to be quite clear that the Bible is not the place in which to obtain our knowledge of what the Atonement means; in fact, there is no theory of the Atonement in the New Testament.

'The Pauline, Petrine, and Johannine theories, and that of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, are not mutually consistent, and Paul is not always consistent with himself.'

'At present Paul's opinion on this great subject is by many people supposed to be decisive. Paul says this, and Paul says that, and when Paul has spoken there is no more to be said. But why should it be so? Paul's opinion is simply Paul's opinion, and not necessarily a complete and adequate statement of truth. It is entitled to be considered weighty because it is the utterance of a great man, and a great seer of truth, as well as being the earliest writing on the subject which we possess. Any man of the moral and intellectual eminence of Paul is entitled to reverence when he speaks, whether his views are in the Bible or not.'

When we come to Mr. Campbell's opinion, we find in his exposition of the Atonement, if we content ourselves with his positive statements, a great deal that we could gladly and willingly accept. As this is the best part of Mr. Campbell's work we will quote a somewhat lengthy passage:

'It should now be plain why the doctrine of the Atonement has been so closely associated with the doing away of sin; it is because, as we have seen, the root-idea of Atonement is the assertion of the fundamental oneness of man with man and all with God. Sin is the divisive, separating thing in our relations with one another, and with God the source of all, so the assertion of our oneness involves getting rid of sin. If we ask how this is to be done, the answer is simple enough: the only way to get rid of selfishness is by the ministry of love. What is it that is slowly winning the world from its selfishness to-day, and lifting it gradually into the higher, purer atmosphere of universal love? There is but one thing that is doing it, and that is the spirit of self-sacrifice. Wherever you see that, you see the true Atonement at work. There can be no doubt about

the final issue, for behind the spirit of love is infinity, whereas the spirit of selfishness is essentially finite. On the field of human history the death of Jesus is the focus and concentrated essence of this age-long atoning process, whereby selfishness is being overcome, and the whole race lifted up to its home in God. Until Jesus came, no self-offering had been so consistent and so complete. No selfish desire could find lodgment in His pure soul. He showed men the ideal life by living it Himself—the life which was perfectly at one with God and man. In a selfish world that life was sure to end on a Calvary of some kind, but the very fact that it did so demonstrated the completeness of its victory over all considerations of self-interest. Selfishness lost the battle by seeming to gain it. God was behind the life of Jesus just because it was the life of perfect love, the life which was a perfect gift to the whole; therefore that life immediately arose in power in other lives, and has gone on increasing its benevolent sway over human hearts ever since. This is the Atonement, and it is rightly associated with the cross of Jesus in the minds of men, for the cross is the sum and centre of it all.'

All this is very true and it is admirably put; but why and how has the world, if not Mr. Campbell, learnt it? It has learnt it through the continuous, recurring influence of the belief in the reality of the Atonement by the Son of God, and through the continuous study of the writings of the New Testament. The human race did not discover this unaided; it came to them through the revelation in Christ as interpreted in the New Testament. That revelation has taught us something profoundly different and on a different plane and level from anything which other books have taught us: while they have presented what is incomplete, it presents what is complete. We can read the whole history of the development of the idea of sacrifice from the earliest ethnic systems; we can see how the old crude ideas were, under the influence of Jewish Monotheism, idealized and purified until they have taught men the deep and profound lessons of union with God, of the need of atonement for sin, of the offering to God of all that is highest and best in us. We can see the time come when this system begins to break down, when people

still needing atonement ask, Can the blood of bullocks and goats really cleanse from sin? Then in a world yearning for sacrifice, but doubting about sacrifice, comes the life of Jesus which exhibits a life of perfect sacrifice on earth, ending with an heroic death. The disciples of Jesus, guided by His own words, interpreted this life in the light of the prophetic and sacrificial teaching of the Old Testament which they knew so well and which we know so imperfectly. Everything that that sacrificial system had claimed to do His death had done. As the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us, His death was the original of which the sacrifices were the copy and shadow. The whole language of the sacrificial system might therefore be transferred to Christ, not by way of metaphor but by way of reality. The sacrifices were the metaphor, the shadow—the death of Christ was the reality. But why was this sacrifice so different from other sacrifices? Because it was a sacrifice of will, because it was self-sacrifice, because it revealed the love of God for man, because it shewed what God was in His real Nature. But were the life and death of Christ merely a sort of drama, enacted to give an instance of heroic self-sacrifice to men, or was it merely an act of human heroism? Both these suggestions are thrown out nowadays, but neither would account for the power of the Atonement, or enable us to feel that the teaching was real. As Mr. Walker puts it—we are glad to quote his book—

'It was always the Cross on which Christ died, in some real sense, *because of our sins and for our salvation.* Is it necessary to seek to reduce it to some set formula? I do not think so. We should inevitably omit something, or perhaps bring in something of our own merely. Better to stand reverently in the presence of that Cross. The Cross of the Sinless in a world of sin speaks for itself, and, in spite of all denials, it will continue to speak to the consciences of men. It is enough to say that the Cross on which Christ "tasted death for every man" was the Divinely appointed means whereby God's forgiving Love went forth to men so as to save them from sin and self, and therefore also from the consequences of the merely self-centred life.' [1]

[1] W. L. Walker, *What about the New Theology?* p. 197.

The point we wish to emphasize is that the lesson mankind has learnt from the Cross of Christ it has learnt because it felt that, however one might explain it, the Cross of Christ, the death of Christ, was a necessary act of self-sacrifice on His part. God became man for the sin of mankind : it was the death of the Son of God, and therefore it revealed that which was above man. It was an Atonement, a necessary atonement for sin, and therefore it was real. It is these two beliefs which have made the Cross of Christ an influence. How we may explain the Atonement we may not be able to say, but when we read the long history of the doctrine of the Atonement, the spirit in which we should do so is not that of pointing out how wrong everyone was, but of seeing how true everyone was. Each age felt that the death of Christ saved them from the form in which evil had come. Athanasius, in the corrupt life of the fourth century when the world seemed very evil, saw how, through the Cross, the Divine image was restored to mankind. The Christian missionary of the Dark Ages, living in a world which seemed peopled by evil spirits, knew that he and those who listened to him had received salvation from the powers of darkness in the Cross of Christ. The mediæval theologian, brooding over the tremendous majesty of the Divine sovereignty, feeling how sin was a tremendous violation of that majesty and sanctity, felt that a great sacrifice had been offered and a great reparation paid. The Reformer, haunted with a continual sense of his own sin, thrown back on the introspection of his individual life, and feeling his awful unworthiness, found in the Cross his salvation. The modern thinker, appalled by the inadequacy of his own consciousness of guilt, sees in the contrition of Christ the true ideal contrition. None of them were wrong ; they are all right. It is only wrong when a particular aspect of the Atonement is lifted into being necessary orthodox doctrine, when a scheme of salvation is put before us, when a human interpretation of the Atonement is put in the place of the Atonement.

When we read Maurice's stern protest against the form of theology of his own day we can sympathize with him.

There is a great deal in what Mr. Campbell writes which is, we will not say true, but a half-understood representation of what is true. He knows a little about Semitic origins, a little about modern theories of sacrifice, a little about St. Paul's rabbinical learning, but he does not know enough about anything to use his knowledge properly, and he has not the sense of reverence and respect for the great thinkers who have preceded him to enable him to re-interpret the Gospel to the present day. So far as we are aware the world is not suffering from the unreal presentation of an orthodox theory of Atonement; it is suffering much more because it is only laboriously adapting its mind to new and destructive criticism, and we do not think that Mr. Campbell helps it to do so.

VI.

There are many more points in Mr. Campbell's book upon which we might dwell. In all we should find the same element of half-truth, but it is hardly worth while to deal with it in greater detail, and we propose to ask rather, Where is the fundamental error underlying Mr. Campbell's writings? And (since we consider him typical of a very large body of thought) What are the more serious difficulties at the present day? The first point we should put in the guise of a quotation from Dr. Forsyth, in an article on 'The Newest Theology' in the *British Weekly*.

'*Wherein*,' he asks, '*does the theological situation to-day differ from that of thirty or fifty years ago—especially on the progressive side?* And the answer appears to me to carry us to the point I am always pressing but cannot easily get people to face—the point of our central and final authority. It is a question which does not trouble those who live spiritually from hand to mouth, and are satisfied with the beauties, the charities, the graciousness generally, of the religious life. Nor does it weigh on those who are immersed in the philanthropies or politics which engross the hour. But it is the question of the day in those Churches and sections of society where men still have the educated habit of thoroughness, and the persistent resolution to know just where they honestly are. It is the question wherever the pursuit of perfection takes the place of slipshod religionism, and

where men are sure that no Church can continue to stand unless it have a definite relation to a positive authority, and a real sympathy with every effort to force attention to that point. No Church, no preacher, knows where he is till he has a sure sense of his relation to such an authority. The Bible as a book has gone in that final sense. What replaces it ? Is it in your own reason you find your Master ? It is the urgency of this question of authority that makes the great difference between the position to-day and that of half a century ago.' [1]

What is to be our authority ? That is the question Dr. Forsyth asks, and on that point Mr. Campbell will agree with him—that the Bible has gone in the sense of a final authority. In that sense we should also agree with him, but we should not think that this was entirely new. The only change is that modern criticism has brought home to the Protestant world the inadequacy of the Bible as a final authority. Having recognized that, let us state at once that it is only for those who accepted in its crudest form the Bible and the Bible only as their authority that the present situation makes any real change. The result of the newest criticism has only been to continue a process which began when Erasmus first attempted to criticize the Bible in a historic sense. The change from the Middle Ages has been a slow and complicated one, hampered not only by fear of unorthodoxy but by the fact that Protestantism stereotyped a particular stage of the process. It has been throughout the work of scholars. The authority of the Vulgate had to be overthrown, and the authority of the scholastic interpretation which treated the Bible like a big law book. Allegory had to yield to history, traditional interpretations to grammar, and it is that change which is only being continued at the present day in what is called the higher criticism. The higher criticism does not overthrow the Bible : it only introduces another and we believe a more rational method of interpreting it. It has made the problems of the Old Testament very much less difficult ; it brings out its reality and spiritual religion. It is only to those to whom the Bible has been the one, only, final

[1] *The British Weekly*, March 7, 1907.

authority that the difficulty is really serious. But the Church of England has always laid down in one way or another in her many formulæ that the Christian faith is older than the New Testament. And as Mr. Walker remarks:

> 'This faith, I would next point out, does not rest primarily on any *Scriptures*. The New Testament was the *product* of this faith, not its foundation. There was no such Book in the hands of the earliest Christians. But there was in them a glowing enthusiasm of love for God and for humanity, kindled by simple faith in Christ and His Cross.' [1]

To us the Christian faith is that faith which we know historically to have been taught by the Church from the beginning, and which has been enshrined and formulated in the great Creed which is the ultimate product of centuries of Christian thought and controversy and of four great Councils of the Church. Its authority is twofold. On the one side it represents the teaching of the universal Church; on the other side it may be proved by most certain warrant of Scripture. In the authority of the Church as interpreting Scripture and as controlled by Scripture we can, in the present day, find a quite adequate basis of belief.

No doubt we shall be reminded at once that the ultimate authority is reason; that is Dr. Forsyth's solution of the ultimate authority, as it is Mr. Campbell's. The ultimate authority for each individual quite truly is his own reason and his own conscience; that one can never escape from. You may accept the infallibility of the Pope, but it requires an act of reason to assent to it, conscious or unconscious, and no one can escape from the ultimate individual decision. But Christianity claims to be a revelation, and we ask in what documents or in what form the contents of that revelation are contained. We are ourselves quite satisfied with the answer that we can give—the Bible interpreted by the Church, the doctrine of the Church as corroborated by the Scriptures. That is not a mechanical authority. To seek for mechanical authority

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 18.

which will abnegate the functions or the powers of reason is to flee from our individual responsibility. Our authority demands from every thoughtful person the use of the gifts that God has given him; but he is able to use those gifts not wandering without a chart over a trackless ocean, but going through the uncertain voyage of life with a knowledge and a teaching which will be, if he is willing, a sufficient guide. It is an authority which gives a healthy Creed to the simple-minded, which does not bind us with the fetters of the past, nor submit us to a spiritual despotism, but provides for all thoughtful minds the material needed for working out the great problems of life and salvation.

For our second point we would take a characteristic utterance of Mr. Campbell, 'Religion is necessary to mankind but Churches are not.' Our answer would be that because religion is necessary to mankind therefore Churches are—or rather to put it more correctly, the Church is—necessary. Mr. Campbell's book contains a great deal of a certain sort of fashionable carping against the Christian Churches, although he admits incidentally that they do a large amount of good. We are as conscious as anyone that the organized Christian societies of the world are very inadequate representations of their ideal; but, as we look at the condition of the world and at the life of the great mass of our fellow-countrymen, we are firmly convinced that it is not primarily in the Churches that the fault lies. The Christian ideal is imperfectly realized, but it is within the Churches, and not outside them, that it is most adequately represented. No doubt we are in a sense to blame—everyone is—for every sin that our brother commits, but the fashionable language which would suggest that all the good in the world lies among those persons who entirely renounce the authority of the Church and the obligations of religion is to us absolutely untrue. It is cant, and nothing but cant. Much of the reaction against Christianity arises not primarily because the Churches are antiquated, but because men wish to live a selfish and material life, and Christianity is a check and restraint on them. We do

not deny the existence of many good and high-minded men outside the Church, but the good men and the good women for the most part are now, as they have been in the past, earnest workers in the Christian Churches. The good work that is done is done directly or indirectly because of the Christian societies realizing more adequately than others the lessons of Christianity. It is not in revolt from the Churches, but in a higher realization of the ideal of the Church, that the remedy must come. Above all it is because the inadequate conception of 'Churches' has taken the place of the Church as a great ideal. We are not speaking now simply in the interests of our own or for any other particular community. We do not wish to use any language that should un-church, as the phrase is, our fellow Christians. We would put clearly forward that it is just in such a spirit of disintegration and of individualism that the theological difficulties at the present time arise. We do not desire to hamper individual thought in any way, but the individual thought should be the reverent thought of one who has behind him the whole traditions of Catholic Christianity, not the precarious speculation of one who starts from some particular sect. It is just here that Mr. Campbell's theology fails, and fails completely. The problems he deals with are problems that we all have to face. The solutions that he gives us often contain an approximation to the truth, but he fails because he starts as an individualist —and shall we say as a Protestant?—and not with the life of corporate Christianity behind him. He fails because his attitude towards the Christianity of the past and the Christianity of the present is not that of the reverent scholar, who knows that if he does his work he will advance beyond his teacher, and who should be ashamed of himself if he cannot, but of the clever critic. The clever critic fails, as he always will fail, because he has no reverence. The solution of the problems that Mr. Campbell raises will always be more adequate and true the more the thinker is Catholic and not merely Protestant, reverent and not only critical, believing in the working of the Spirit of God in the Christian Society rather than assuming that the place

where God's Spirit works is everywhere but in the historic Church. The greater the unity of the Christian world, the more nearly it preaches the true ideal of the Christian Church, the sooner it will attain to Christian truth.

SHORT NOTICES.

I.—Biblical Studies.

Silanus the Christian. By E. A. Abbott. (London : A. and C. Black, 1906.) *7s. 6d.*

Renan, in the preface to his *Marcus Aurelius*, expresses his profound conviction that 'the period of origins, the embryogeny of Christianity, if one may so express it, ends approximately at the year 180.' The belief of the great critic has received emphatic corroboration from the labours of ecclesiastical historians. The second century is *the* period about which we desire to know most, and about which, as a matter of fact, we know least. On the one side we have the Apostolic Church, with all the freedom and even indefiniteness of organization, of worship, of doctrine inseparable from the earliest stages of a new religion : on the other the tentative and experimental period is almost passed ; necessary restrictions, limitations essential for progress in the right direction, judicious conciliations and advanced controversies, all proclaim the silent revolution that has been in progress. But between these two periods there is a great gap ; nor, despite much brilliant work and not a few important discoveries, can we congratulate ourselves on having satisfactorily bridged it.

Four problems at least stand out as particularly important for the student of this second century—the growth of the Christian Ministry, the formulation of the Christian Creed, the emergence of a New Testament Canon (and especially the universal acceptance of the Four Gospels, and narrowing our circle again, the origin and authorship of the Fourth) and lastly the relation of the Church to heathen philosophy. The comparative paucity of materials gives free scope for an imaginative reconstruction of the period by an historian who is ready

to base his theories on the actual facts of which evidence is forthcoming, and not to twist such facts as we do possess into reluctant accordance with his preconceived theories.

Unfortunately, Dr. Abbott cannot be dissociated from the latter class. *Silanus the Christian*, as a romance, is full of interest; as a literary work, it contains some striking passages; as a religious story, it is not without really beautiful expositions; as a critical contribution, it is worthy of the serious attention of all students as the authoritative announcement of Dr. Abbott's own views; but as an historical study, it is almost worthless. We do not here refer to the part of the book devoted to the teaching of Epictetus, and its skilful comparison and contrast with both the Jewish religion and the Christian revelation: that is well done; some passages, indeed, are admirable—they will be found in chapters x. to xiv., which contrast the views of Isaiah and Epictetus respectively on death and providence. But we cannot say so much for the chapters on the criticism of the Gospels, and on the Gospel miracles. We should listen with patience and respect to the reasons which have led Dr. Abbott to consider the records of Christianity to be (as he states in his preface) 'inadequate, inaccurate, and contradictory.' Or had Dr. Abbott written a religious romance of the present day, and used one of the characters as a mouthpiece for his own sentiments, no one would, nor even could, have found fault. But the case stands quite differently when the results of purely modern criticism are put into the mouth of a second century convert. The first essential of an historian is the capacity to lose himself in his characters: he must speak as they would have spoken; they should not speak as he would have done. We must enter an emphatic protest against the use of these ancient Romans and Greeks as the mouthpieces of twentieth century criticism. It throws over the latter the mantle of antiquity to which it has not the remotest claim. If we had knowledge that the problems raised by modern writers were largely canvassed before the middle of the second century, the whole outlook would be changed. It is just this very fact, that they are wholly at variance with everything we know as to either the historical or critical standpoint of those days, that makes us refuse to accept them as a true explanation of the various difficulties for which a solution has to be found. To introduce these modern views as natural reflections in the mouths of second century characters is to beg the whole question, and is also most misleading for those who are unable to discriminate between the author and his

characters. It is possible that we do Dr. Abbott an injustice; but even the most obtuse of literary critics cannot fail to note the connexion (similarity of thought being, of course, far more subtle, and yet not less easily felt than identity of language) between the criticism of Scaurus and the articles characteristic of the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. Is it possible to regard the latter as an apocryphal work, written long since, perused by Scaurus, treasured by the faithful, but only in these latter times produced for the edification of the Church? Yes, Scaurus must have read that famous work. The hypothesis may sound extravagant; but after reading *Silanus* the impartial critic will admit its obvious simplicity compared with not a few of the views put forward in that book. It has, moreover, the further merit of being the only alternative which will rescue the historical worth of Dr. Abbott's story.[1]

We have somewhere seen a theory spoken of as a tissue of complicated improbabilities. We think the phrase might have been reserved with advantage as an appropriate description of not a few of the views advanced in this book to shew the untrustworthiness of the Gospels as historical narratives. Scaurus on the Resurrection is particularly brilliant, particularly wild, and particularly unconvincing. At the present it is customary with most critics to regard St. Luke as a careful and accurate historian. But to Dr. Abbott he is 'only a compiler laboriously tracing back the truth through documents,' mixing up fact and fiction, prose and poetry in the most extraordinary manner, and continually making 'errors much to be regretted' (p. 254).

Space forbids us to go through all the numerous criticisms, emendations, and explanations which abound in such prolific profusion. But we would point out a general reflection wherewith we can console ourselves. Dr. Abbott disparages historical witness as a basis of belief, and he adds that 'true conviction is derived from no source but the convincing spirit of the Saviour coming to us in various ways and through many instruments, but mostly through disciples whom the Saviour loves.' That is very true; but the various ways and many instruments do not exclude the evangelical testimony. For belief in a fact or in a credible witness may be the first step to belief in Him of whom the witness is borne or the fact recorded, even as Christ's first words were an exhortation to 'believe in the Gospel.'

[1] At any rate Clemens is acquainted with Hymns Ancient and Modern, 260! (P. 357.)

With regard to the Fourth Gospel, the author says much that is beautiful, much that is true; and he says it with force and directness. His statement with regard to the external testimony as to the supremacy of the three Gospels (288) needs modification, and his statement that Justin *never* quotes the fourth verbally is surely not quite accurate, in the face of the almost certain quotation of our Lord's words with regard to the 'new birth.' Again, the raising of Lazarus is treated as an example of 'metaphor for fact' (337). But the metaphor is so extremely elaborate that it could hardly be the origin of the vivid and simple narrative of fact, while a simple fact might quite well serve as the basis for elaborate metaphor. The water and the blood from the Saviour's side is explained as an apocalyptic vision (329, 357). 'That it is not a fact could be proved if needful.' It is not 'needful to prove' that Dr. Abbott minimizes the part played by John the Apostle, the eye-witness, in the composition of the Gospel—and 'the book is a poem, not a history.'

Dr. Abbott has a great name, a great reputation; and deservedly so. This book is assured of a wide and appreciative circle. Sympathetic reviewers have predicted for it a career of immense influence. We have therefore thought it our duty to point out its weaknesses. The book as a whole is marked by much penetrating criticism, valuable as Dr. Abbott's personal contribution to the controversy surrounding an exceptionally difficult problem; as a literary romance, it is full of charm; but while we hope that we shall always be duly grateful to any distinguished scholar for giving us the benefit of his researches, and, most of all, when they are presented in a popular and readable form, yet we cannot approve of a method which seems to give modern theories the credit of antiquity, to which they have absolutely no claim.

The Fourth Gospel, its Purpose and Theology. By E. F. Scott, M.A. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1906.) 6s. net.

This book is an attempt to draw out the teaching of the Fourth Gospel on the assumption that it is a controversial work of the second century, written by one who had never known Jesus after the flesh. The Gospel, it is urged, is an attempt to combine a presentation of the Christian religious experience with a justification of that experience in terms of current philosophy. The writer has presented this in the form of a

Gospel because he has grasped the supreme value of the historic revelation in Jesus.

To begin with, the value of this attempt is seriously lessened by the inability of Mr. Scott to discriminate between what is fanciful and what is reasonable. For instance, he is inclined to see in the incident of Nathanael a symbolical allusion to St. Paul, the Israelite indeed, and a claim for his rightful place among the very chiefest of the Apostles. This will serve to shew how completely the historical side of the Gospel is given up. The whole has been created out of the Synoptic Gospels as interpreted in Christian life and experience. The vivid touches of detail are due to the fine instinct of a literary artist, or introduced as veiled allegorical allusions for their symbolic value. Thus the story of Lazarus is woven out of the raising of Jairus' daughter and the widow's son, the Lucan account of Martha and Mary, and the parable of Dives and Lazarus with its significant closing words 'Neither will they believe though one be raised from the dead.' The Virgin Mother is the ancient faith, which is absorbed in the Church and so dwells in the house of the disciple. The Resurrection and Ascension are simultaneous, though a concession is made to tradition in the shape of the story of the appearance to Mary; 'but his own interpretation allowed no room for an Ascension such as is described by the writer of Acts' (p. 308).

Mr. Scott finds in the Gospel a development, along peculiar lines, of Paulinism. The doctrine of the Spirit has really no place in the religious position of John, because the Parousia is present and not future; and so the Spirit simply represents the present influence of Christ. But is it possible to account satisfactorily for the place which the doctrine occupies in the life of the early Church and the teaching of St. Paul apart from the teaching on the subject preserved in this Gospel? Jesus, we are told, alludes to the Spirit in only a few isolated sayings of minor importance; and the language which suggests the personality of the Spirit must not be pressed, for 'the Spirit is an influence imparted through Christ to those who believe in Him' (p. 343). The attitude to the Logos doctrine is of a piece with the rest. In it John presents a semi-physical magical view of life, which obscures the more majestic and important background of the historic life. This metaphysical theory has led to what is regarded as a false view of the sacraments as Sacraments, and to the substitution of a barren dogma for a living faith.

The Fourth Gospel and some recent German Criticism. By H. L. Jackson, B.D. (Cambridge University Press, 1906.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

This volume embodies a course of lectures given on Sunday afternoons to parishioners. They are entirely critical and reasons are wisely included why, for the time being, much which the Christian reader naturally values most must be put on one side.

The method adopted is to put forward the views of two representative German critics—Barth and Wernle—with references to many others, and then to make an independent examination of each question and to summarize the evidence. We think Mr. Jackson would have been better advised, had he somewhat narrowed down the quotations and the points discussed. The issues would have gained in clearness, and the needs of the general reader been sufficiently met. Even as it is, the book will, we believe, prove distinctly useful.

The conclusion is naturally not decisive, but it is thought that John the Apostle and the beloved disciple are distinct persons, and that the Gospel is the work of the latter. We are disappointed with the section on Miracle. We are told that there are two conceptions of miracle—a very distortion of the wonderful, the downright prodigy, and that which though strange is not contrary to reason, but admits of explanation, a marvel in perfect harmony with Law. The outcome is that Mr. Jackson finds the explanation of the miracles of Cana of Galilee, and of feeding the five thousand in figurative utterances which have come to be understood literally. The Christian accepts miracle because he believes in the direct action of God, and that, to quote Bishop Gore, 'He breaks into the common order of events, in order to manifest the real meaning of nature.' [1] It is better to leave the matter as it stands in the Gospel than to throw overboard a miracle so widely attested as the feeding of the multitude.

The Gospel of the Rejection. A Study in the Relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Three. By the Rev. W. Richmond, Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. (London: Murray, 1906.) 5*s.* net.

Mr. Richmond takes the three points of the scene of the events, the substance of the teaching, and the disciples' apprehension of

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, p. 45.

our Lord's claim, as contrasted in the four Gospels, and maintains, in opposition to Dr. Drummond's general conclusions, that the story of the three presupposes the facts which St. John supplies, and is only explicable if Jerusalem had already developed an antagonism to Christ. This antagonism, he urges, was provoked by the revelation of truth which Jerusalem ought to have been ready to accept, though the Galilean disciples needed to be prepared and led on to its apprehension. Mr. Richmond, it will be observed, is not considering questions of authenticity, authorship, or authority. His point is the historical gain of St. John's Gospel, taken as it stands. He treats the subject somewhat in the style of Dr. Young's *The Christ of History*, and his matter will prove interesting not only to the student and the harmonist, but to the general reader. After discussing the main thesis under the heads which we have indicated, Mr. Richmond adds some supplementary illustrations of some of the less obvious differences between St. John and the other Evangelists: namely, omissions in one of the incidents told in the others, the different place of miracles in the two narratives, and the different picture of our Lord's Person and character. The book is a modest but valuable contribution to the study of the Gospels.

A Grammar of New Testament Greek. By J. H. Moulton, D. Lit. Vol. I. Prolegomena. First edition ('based on W. F. Moulton's edition of G. B. Winer's Grammar'). Second edition, with corrections and additions. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1906.) 8*s.* net.

The fact that a second edition of this book was called for within six months of its first appearance is the highest testimonial to its importance and a welcome sign of the widespread interest in the exact study of the New Testament. The second edition differs from the first in the addition of some seven pages of notes, a slight recasting of the Preface, and in a significant change (made with some reluctance) in the title, from which the reference to 'Moulton's Winer' now disappears.

The previous history of Winer-Moulton is no doubt familiar to all students of the New Testament. Winer's epoch-making *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms* saw the light over fifty years ago. In 1870 it appeared first in an English dress, edited by Dr. W. F. Moulton, whose work has long been recognized as the manual in the subject for English readers. A new

edition, however, has of recent years been a desideratum; Dr. W. F. Moulton's educational work debarred him from any revision on a large scale in the later English editions of 1877 and 1882, and it has been left to the able hands of his son, on whom has descended (though he would be the first to disclaim it) a double portion of his father's spirit, to make full use of the large material which has been accumulating during the last half-century.

The present instalment, at any rate, is an entirely new and independent work. In it are laid down the general principles which must govern the study of the New Testament language in future; and the student is taken through the various departments of the Accidence and Syntax and shewn the salient characteristics of the New Testament language in the light of the new evidence. A detailed discussion is reserved for later volumes.

The 'new evidence,' which has effected a revolution in our ideas, is that afforded by the papyri, unearthed in Egypt mainly within the last decade, new volumes of which continue to appear with bewildering rapidity. Here we have a mass of documents, most of them accurately dated, others capable of being dated approximately, ranging over a thousand years from 300 B.C. to the eighth century A.D., including letters, wills, contracts, petitions, &c., written by persons of every grade in the social scale. We thus possess for this millennium the fullest knowledge of vernacular Greek as spoken in Egypt. Yet the evidence is not entirely new. The Paris Papyri were edited over forty years ago, and the Turin collection has been accessible for twice that length of time; but, somehow, the earlier collections remained unnoticed until the recent discoveries brought them into prominence. It is Dr. Moulton's privilege to have been the first to bring these documents to bear upon the grammar of the New Testament, following the lead of Dr. Deissmann in Germany, who has done similar pioneer work in connexion with the vocabulary of the Greek Bible. And what is the result? Dr. Moulton finds that the language of the New Testament writers is simply that of the Κοινή, the language of the common people spoken wherever the Greek language was spoken since the time of Alexander. New Testament Greek is simply a department of the Κοινή: 'Biblical Greek' becomes almost an obsolete term: the old controversy between the Purists (who endeavoured to bring every novelty under Attic rules) and the Hebraists (who exaggerated the Semitic influence)

must give place to the recognition that New Testament Greek is not an isolated phenomenon, lying in a back-water, but stands out in the main stream of the development of the Greek language. Some readers may regard with natural regret this deposition, as it may appear, of the New Testament language from the unique position which it has sometimes been supposed to hold. There can, however, no longer be a doubt as to the correctness of the general conclusions arrived at, and that in future the papyri must be taken as the starting point and clue to the correct understanding of the New Testament. There is in reality little cause for regret in the fact that the earliest records which we possess of the sayings of Christ and the writings of His followers were written in the language 'understanded of the people.' Dr. Moulton admits (p. 20) that the language of the several New Testament writers must be studied in connexion with that of the sacred volume as a whole, and a few instances are given where Christianity may have definitely affected the grammar (p. 68, πιστεύειν εἰς, cf. p. 192 on οὐ μή). It is possible that the number of these instances will be increased when the detailed portion of the Grammar appears.

The main result of the papyri studies of Dr. Moulton and Dr. Deissmann has been, if not quite to eliminate, yet very largely to reduce the number of so-called 'Hebraisms' in the New Testament. Again and again phrases hitherto regarded as such find illustration in documents where Jewish influence is out of the question or highly improbable. Dr. Moulton makes some acute observations on this subject: attention may specially be called to his remark that Semitic influence is chiefly seen in the 'overworking' of a good Greek word owing to the fact that it corresponds to a word which in Hebrew is in constant use. To this tendency is traced the frequency of ἰδού in some New Testament writers—a phenomenon which is happily illustrated by the 'look you' which is always on the lips of Shakespeare's Captain Fluellen. Yet even this frequency of ἰδού appears not to be wholly due to Semitism: how, for instance, are we to explain as of Semitic origin the normal rendering in the LXX of הלא, *Nonne*, by οὐκ (οὐχ) ἰδού? We must be prepared to find curious coincidences in the vernacular of languages of different families where borrowing is out of the question. The writer points out (p. 94) that Modern Greek agrees with Hebrew in expressing the relative after the manner of Mrs. Gamp, 'which her name is Mrs. Harris': similarly the comparative in Modern Greek may be expressed

by the positive with ἀπό, which corresponds exactly to Hebrew usage. Still a doubt arises whether this elimination of Hebraisms is not in danger of being carried too far; the possibility of the populous Jewish settlements in Alexandria and in other large centres of Hellenism having influenced the Κοινή should not be left quite out of sight, though, as the author justly says (p. 94), 'the presence of a usage in Modern Greek affords an almost decisive disproof of Semitism in the Κοινή, only one small corner of whose domain came within range of Semitic influences.' The student of Hellenistic Greek has constantly to look on to the ultimate resultant in the spoken Greek of to-day.

Special mention may be made of the very able treatment of the Tenses. Here, if not quite for the first time (for Burton's *Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* had introduced English readers to the subject), yet in the most masterly manner and with admirable lucidity the views of recent German philologists on the primary function of the tenses as indicating 'modes of action' are brought to bear upon the exegesis of the New Testament.

The style of the work is lively and humorous, and even, we are bound to confess, perhaps occasionally too much so. There is a wealth of happily-chosen 'modern instances,' and the writer has certainly achieved in this introductory volume his ambition of writing a Grammar which can be read.

His pioneer work on the papyri, of which the detailed results are recorded in the pages of the *Classical Review*, might be supplemented by some minutiae. For instance, it appears from the investigations of one who has done some gleaning in the same field that οὐθείς is another form which, like ὃς ἐάν (p. 43), can be traced from the cradle to the grave. First found in an inscription of 378 B.C., it is practically universal in the papyri from 301 to 132 B.C., when it begins to give way to οὐδείς and finally disappears about 200 A.D. Even in the matter of 'the notorious equivalence of ει and ι' (p. 47) the papyri yield some definite results: γίνεσθαι (the Hellenistic equivalent for γίγν.) does not appear to have been written as γείνεσθαι till towards the end of the second century B.C. (the earliest certain examples we have noted by the present writer are in Turin Pap. 5 and 6 circ. 125 B.C. and Tebtunis Pap. 66 of 121–0 B.C.): γεινώσκειν appears to have originated at about the same time. The last thirty years of that century seem to have been a period of transition in matters of orthography.

Illustrations from the LXX might also be supplemented.

The use of the nominative for the name-case unaltered by the construction of the sentence (p. 69) is frequent in LXX (*e.g.* Gen. iii. 20, ἐκάλεσεν Ἀδὰμ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς γυναικὸς Ζωή, Num. xxi. 14, ἐν βιβλίῳ Πόλεμος τοῦ κυρίου) : the use of the historic present (p. 121) is not so 'rare in the LXX' as Sir John Hawkins, judging by the absence of λέγει, represents it to be (145 exx. occur in 1 Kingdoms alone) : ἐὰν ἦν (p. 168) is also fairly common in LXX, ἦν in some cases apparently standing for ᾖ to avoid hiatus, though this will not apply, *e.g.*, to Job xxii. 3, ἐὰν σὺ ἦσθα : the use of the subjunctive in comparisons (p. 185) might be illustrated from Is. vii. 2, xvii. 11, xxxi. 4 : on p. 205 it may be added that the inf. of purpose is common in the LXX, with the distinction that with verbs of motion (coming and sending, &c.) it is usually simple, not articular. But of course in these Prolegomena abundance of illustration from this quarter is not to be expected.

Very few misprints have been noted in the second edition : they occur on p. 110 (last line of text), 111 note 1 (accent), 198 note 1 (should not ἀλλὰ be ἄλλα ?), 246 note on p. 103 (? read 'stands' for 'supplies'). It may be added that in the reference to the second English edition of Blass' *New Testament Grammar* on p. xvii the words 'occasional reference is made to the second German edition' are hardly a fair description : the two German editions were carefully collated and practically all alterations or additions incorporated.

The book, in short, at once takes or has taken its place as the standard authority on the subject, and the subsequent instalments will be eagerly expected ; it is to be hoped that they will not meet with the fate which seems to have befallen the new edition of Winer in its native land.

II. Doctrinal and Practical Theology.

Sin. 'Oxford Library of Practical Theology.' By H. V. S. Eck, M.A., Rector of Bethnal Green. (London : Longmans, 1907.) 5*s*.

Mr. Eck has here given us a book of real, though of unequal, value. Few things are more needed to-day than a full and clear restatement of the Christian doctrine of Sin, in view of modern knowledge, and Mr. Eck has certainly done something to supply this need. He writes, as he modestly explains, not so much from the standpoint of the thinker and theologian, as from that of the parish priest, himself deeply engaged in the conflict with

Sin, and interested above all in that which makes for victory over it. Thus, though on the intellectual side he does not greatly help us, it will be our own fault if we do not on the practical side find much that he says of the highest value.

Perhaps it may be well to point out at once where the book appears to us to fail. Mr. Eck scarcely seems to recognize how real are the difficulties which the Christian doctrine presents. Firstly, there are the difficulties involved in the assertion of the freedom of the will; secondly, there is the difficulty of reconciling the existence of moral evil with the power and goodness of God; and, thirdly, there is the difficulty of maintaining the Christian doctrine of original sin, in view of our present scientific knowledge. Mr. Eck does deal to some extent with the problem of freedom, but the other difficulties are never really faced. However insoluble a problem the origin of evil may present, it would surely be worth while in a book such as this, to point out how necessary, even to our limited vision, the permission of moral evil must be, and the glorious purposes which it may be seen to serve. A world without the possibility of moral evil would be a world without the possibility of moral conflict and victory, and so a world lower in the scale of being than the world we know. Mr. Eck's dealing with the question of original sin is again most unsatisfactory. Direct reference to Dr. Tennant's book is confined to one footnote, while the powerful arguments advanced in *The Origin and Propagation of Sin* meet with no attempt to answer them. Indeed, the whole position of those who agree with Dr. Tennant seems to be radically misunderstood. Mr. Eck writes, on p. 28: 'If what we mean by original sin is merely the survival of certain brute instincts, then what we mean by actual sin is robbed entirely of its sinful character; if we may so put it, sin ceases to be sinful.'

But this is not so at all. On Dr. Tennant's view, the brute instincts that have survived are part of the material with which our free will is called to deal, and the refusal to control them is truly and properly sin. No satisfactory answer to Dr. Tennant is possible without a more careful examination of the source of our moral weakness than Mr. Eck has given. The mystery which confronts us is, not that we possess animal tendencies which require careful control, but that apart from divine grace we seem unable entirely to control them. Why have we not this power? Should we not have expected that, when moral consciousness appeared in man, God would have given him such a union with Himself as would enable the moral will

to control these lower impulses? Catholic theology differs from Dr. Tennant, not so much in the view it takes as to their source as in its conviction that God did what we might have expected Him to do. He gave us a supernatural union with Himself, and by the Fall we have lost it.

When we pass from intellectual questions to the practical side of the problem of Sin, Mr. Eck is far more helpful. He brings out clearly what the essential character of Sin is. It is, he says on pp. 83, 84: 'The rebellion of a person against a Person, the rebellion of the will of the creature against the Will of that Divine Person who with perfect Knowledge and unerring Wisdom and ineffable Love made him what he is, and gave him a law which, if he obeyed it, would lead him onwards to the uttermost perfection of his being.'

That surely is just what needs to be brought out. The will of God, so to say, is not a mere aesthetic preference for one course of action rather than another; it is the will of One who 'worketh even until now,' and will ever work, for the accomplishment of His purpose of holiness and love, and who demands of us only what is necessary for our co-operation with Him. Clashing will ever bring alienation, and the greater and nobler the purpose that is set aside, the greater the alienation. On all this, Mr. Eck is excellent, as he also is on the real, as contrasted with the false, distinction between mortal and venial sin. Very useful, also, will be his reproduction of Dr. Moberly's teaching on Punishment, Forgiveness and Penitence. It may be hoped that many who have found that teaching difficult to grasp, as Dr. Moberly himself has expressed it, will gain from Mr. Eck's book all that is most important in it, and thus be enabled to hand it on to others.

The Substance of Faith allied with Science. A Catechism for Parents and Teachers. By Sir Oliver Lodge, F.R.S., Principal of the University of Birmingham. (London: Methuen and Co., 1906). 2*s.* net.

This book is sure of a cordial welcome from a wide circle of readers, and without pretending to agree with it in every detail we think that thoughtful parents and teachers, and above all the clergy, should read it with sympathetic interest. Its author has a considerable reputation as a man of science, and is an intelligent and sympathetic student of theology, but from the theological point of view the book is less satisfactory than the similar work of teachers who are theologians, and also not un-

acquainted with science. It is difficult, perhaps impossible, for any theologian to keep abreast of the rapid growth of scientific knowledge as a whole, when specialists in many departments of science advance so rapidly that they can scarcely expect to be fully understood by other scientific workers in an adjacent field; but there are happily theologians who have learned not only to tolerate, but to welcome and use, new discoveries in natural science for the illustration and enrichment of their own science of God. We believe that if any man is to write a catechism of the sort which will win its way to anything like universal acceptance, he must be a man who is primarily a theologian, but one who, because he is a theologian in the true sense of the word, will eagerly watch the gradual unfolding of the Divine mind and will increasingly manifested in the processes of nature.

The catechism contains twenty questions and answers, many of which are admirably adapted for their purpose, and the Introduction and Commentary greatly enhance the value of the whole. It should be noted that Sir Oliver Lodge has not attempted to produce a complete system of religion; and he is too sane to think that there is a simple and sufficient body of doctrine which should be taught by all sensible men to the *exclusion* of formularies distinctive of separate denominations. By the 'substance' of faith he understands not essence but substratum.

> 'A foundation is not to be mistaken for superstructure; a full-fledged and developed religion needs a great deal more than foundation; there must be building, too. The warmth and vitality imparted by strong religious conviction is a matter of common observation, and is a force of great magnitude; but it is a personal and living thing, it cannot be embodied in a formula or taught in a class. Here lies the proper field of work of the Churches. What can be taught in a school is the fundamental substratum underlying all such developments and personal aspirations; and it can be dealt with on a basis of historical and scientific fact, interpreted and enlarged by the perceptions and experiences of mankind.'

The desire to keep the substratum as broad as possible accounts for the fact that Sir Oliver Lodge neither affirms nor denies the Godhead of our Saviour or His resurrection from the dead. Now we gladly recognize how much that is true and useful about God and man may be taught to children apart from the truths which lie at the very heart of our Creed, but we should regard it as most injurious if this catechism were taught as a substitute for the Apostles' Creed, or the familiar catechism

of the Church, to the children of parents who accept those ancient documents and have no wish to substitute a new theology for the old.

On the other hand, we should esteem it a great gain if schoolmasters, especially in our public schools, would learn from this book to teach science in a way that leaves room for religion, and to teach religion in a way which does not ignore science. The cause of charity and the cause of truth would be well served if men would lay to heart the words of St. Augustine :

'It is a very dangerous and pernicious thing and one greatly to be watched against, that any individual should hear a Christian talking wild nonsense about the earth and the heaven, about the motions and magnitude and intervals of the stars, the courses of years and times, the nature of animals, stones and other matters of the same kind, pretending that he has the authority of the Scriptures on his side. The other who understands these things from reason or experience, seeing that the Christian is utterly ignorant of the subject, that he is wide of the mark by a whole heaven, cannot refrain from laughter.' (*De Gen. ad Lit.* i. 39.)

We cannot attempt any detailed criticism in a short notice and must content ourselves with quoting two or three of the definitions which strike us as containing elements both true and suggestive.

'*Q.* 1. Who are you?

A. I am a being alive and conscious upon this earth ; a descendant of ancestors who rose by gradual processes from lower forms of animal life, and with struggle and suffering became man.'

This answer is not intended to be complete in itself and cannot be fairly criticized without reference to Q. 12 :

'*Q.* What is to be said of man's higher faculties?

A. The faculties and achievements of the highest among mankind—in Art, in Science, in Philosophy and Religion—are not explicable as an outcome of a struggle for existence. Something more than mere life is possessed by us, something represented by the words "mind" and "soul" and "spirit." On one side we are members of the animal kingdom ; on another we are associates in a loftier type of existence, and are linked with the Divine.'

Sir Oliver Lodge has elsewhere said, 'The higher man of to-day is not worrying about his sins at all.' [1] In this connexion, therefore, we have pleasure in quoting his definition of Sin which involves a true doctrine of guilt and responsibility, though we miss the definite expression that Sin is disobedience to Almighty

[1] *Hibbert Journal*, April 1904.

God, and in the case of Christians the breach of a covenant with Him. So far as it goes it is true and striking that

'Sin is the deliberate and wilful act of a free agent who sees the better and chooses the worse, and thereby acts injuriously to himself and others. The root sin is selfishness, whereby needless trouble and pain are inflicted on others; when fully developed it involves moral suicide.'

A Longer Catechism. For Members of the English Church. By Rev. H. E. Hall, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Staines. With Introduction by Rev. F. W. Puller, M.A., S.S.J.E. (London: Knott.)

It is characteristic of the Church of England to be easily satisfied with a small list of formally authoritative documents. The need which has been satisfied in Scotland by the *Larger Catechism* exists in England of course as everywhere else. But, though there is talk from time to time of supplying it, we are still without any formal document of advanced instruction. The present work, first published in 1902, is an attempt by private enterprise to meet the requirement, and the great authority of Father Puller, whom the author invited to introduce his work to the public, is sufficient to ensure for it very careful consideration. The most cursory glance shews that it has one great merit; it is based on the Church Catechism in the Prayer Book, and its teaching may therefore be expected to be strictly an advance on that. It endeavours to deal more fully with matters which the Church Catechism necessarily leaves aside, and this is exactly what is wanted for advanced teaching. Moreover, the author tells us in his prefatory note that it has been tested in practice, and that in forming his definitions he has gone to recognized authorities, such as Hooker and Jeremy Taylor.

To a very large extent we think that the promise of this book is fulfilled. The teaching is clear, and keeps closely to the language of Holy Scripture. This excellence is particularly marked in the section explaining the Creed, where of course it is of very great importance. If we venture, therefore, to offer some criticisms on a few points that have arrested our attention, it will not be inferred, we hope, that criticism represents our general attitude towards the book. To put forms of expression first, we think that the question 'What is God?' (p. 12) is not well expressed. The answer ('God is Spirit') shews that the question really means, 'What do we know of the Nature of God?' Again, on page 14, the question *Why* is Jesus Christ truly God?' seems to us objectionable. The words 'Why' and 'Because' are surely the wrong ones. What is

wanted here also is a statement of the meaning of a particular theological phrase. We regret that the distinction of mortal and venial sins has been imported (p. 28). The distinction is really disciplinary or legal rather than moral, and it seems doubtful whether it serves any valuable purpose. The practical difficulty of it is shewn on the same page; venial sins are said to 'lead on very easily to mortal sin.' It would have been truer to say that acts which may be venial sins in one set of circumstances may easily become mortal, and then it would have been clear that the distinction is not strictly an ethical distinction at all. We regret that in the answer defining Charity (p. 23) there is no allusion to love to man. This, we suppose, is partly due to the disastrous use of the word 'charity' in 1 Cor. xiii. (A.V.), and partly to the exigencies of classification. Theological virtues having been defined as virtues by which 'we are enabled to unite ourselves to God,' the scope of charity is necessarily limited. But the definition is inadequate to St. Paul's account of the virtue. It is perhaps a small point, but we think it would tend to produce confusion in the mind of a pupil to find twelve fruits of the Holy Ghost in his catechism and only nine in his Bible. This is another case in which the desire for classification has done some violence to scriptural language. In the account of the Atonement something more should be said as to the Propitiation of Christ? It is certainly a very difficult idea, and has been gravely distorted; but it is certainly in Scripture, and is, we think, necessary to fill out the idea of Sacrifice.

Confession and Absolution. By ALFRED G. MORTIMER, D.D. (London: Longmans, 1906.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

THIS little book is doctrinal and hortatory. The hortatory part is simple and persuasive. The doctrinal part is also good on the whole, but it shews no freshness of thought and endorses views which we cannot accept; for instance, the quantitative estimate of the temporal punishment of sin, and the denial of voluntary freedom after death (p. 78). The writer takes the judicial rather than the remedial view of absolution, though that view militates against the assurance which the sacrament is intended to give; for who can be sure that the sentence may not have been invalidated by his own deficient contrition or by the priest's laxity? Dr. Mortimer asserts that 'it is of the essence of a sacrament that it should be administered to an individual,' and that if the Absolution in the Communion Service was intended to remit deadly sins, it was the invention of a new sacrament (pp. 108–10). We should say that it was, at most, the introduction of a new method of administering the old

sacrament, and may be compared to the change from the primitive public and episcopal Absolution to the permitted bestowal of the same gift privately by the priest.

We are sorry that a useful book should be marred by faults which a friendly critic is bound to censure.

The Eternal Saviour-Judge. By JAMES LANGTON CLARKE, M.A., late Fellow of the University of Durham. (London : Murray, 1904.) 9*s.* net; new and cheaper edition, 1905, 4*s.* net.

THE object of this book is to offer a solution of eschatological difficulties. Passing by the doctrine of endless retribution and the theories of conditional immortality and universalism, Mr. Clarke suggests that those who will not attain to the reward promised to the faithful may yet be reconciled to God so as to reach, not the full blessing of the covenanted eternal life but a less privilege and service. He bases this view on his interpretation that the saving work and judgeship of Christ have the same abiding character as His priesthood. Without asserting that reconciliation will certainly be the lot of all who fail to gain the fulness of eternal life, he refuses to allow that the condemned are doomed to endless pain and misery and alienation from God, or that there cannot be less and subordinate blessings besides the supreme joy of the promised bliss. The treatment of the subject is thoughtful and temperate; and a useful discussion might be raised whether the view advocated differs in any essential principle from forms of the notion of the amelioration of the condition of the lost which some exponents of the traditional theology have not altogether rejected.

As a positive solution it does not seem to us to allow for the scantiness and uncertainty of its supposed Scriptural basis; for the sense in Scripture and throughout Christian theology of the terrible condition of those who are not among the saved, and of the final issues involved in the use of the probation of this life; and for the force of the considerations which point to the possibility of men becoming morally incapable of repentance and good.

Communion with God. By W. HERRMANN. 'Crown Theological Library.' (Williams and Norgate, 1906.) 5*s.*

THE Ritschlian theology, of which this book is a popular presentation, is an attempt to preserve some of the traditional characteristics of Lutheran Protestantism, and especially its polemic against the Roman Catholic Church, without rejecting

the results of modern Biblical scholarship. It discards certain parts of Luther's teaching, such as his Eucharistic doctrine, as a mere residuum of his former creed, and is almost violently hostile to the whole Greek and Catholic sacramental idea, which it calls mysticism. It still preaches justification by faith, which however it carefully distinguishes from belief. It appeals to 'the historical Christ,' and insists vehemently upon 'history' as the basis of Christian faith, though it declares in the same breath that a critical investigation of the sacred records 'does not give us facts on which our real faith could be based' (p. 69). 'The decision which we reach that these things are facts proceeds from our own independent activity' (p. 71). 'The question whether the portrait of Jesus belongs to fact or fiction . . . . cannot be answered by the science whose business it is to find out what can be proved to be real.' The answer must be based on 'personal conviction,' which will inevitably follow an earnest study of the sources (pp. 73, 113). The features in the Gospel narrative which convey this overpowering impression are 'only two'—'the conflict with pious Judaism,' and Christ's 'remarkable assurance against the opposition of the world' (p. 87). The consciousness of the Christian that God communes with him rests partly on 'the historical fact of the Person of Jesus' (which we arrive at in the manner described above), and partly on the fact that 'we hear within ourselves the demand of the moral law' (p. 103).

In this last clause we reach solid ground. The foundation of the structure is an austere and independent moralism. Conscience, the categorical imperative, is the one religious fact which we know by actual experience. Our 'personal conviction' as to certain historical events, which, we are told, cannot be established by historical methods, can be produced by an effort of the will, concentrated upon the study of the Synoptic narrative. Their validity, rather than their truth, is proved by the state of our feelings which follows the effort. The effort, however, is neither supported nor rewarded by any spiritual communion with the glorified Christ, for the possibility of any such communion is strenuously denied (cf. *e.g.* pp. 282, 291). 'We do not find such communion spoken of in the New Testament[!]' 'The risen Christ is hidden from us.'

To a Churchman, this worship of a dead Christ galvanized into a semblance of life by the moral energy of the believer must seem inexpressibly cold and hollow. And yet this book, like others proceeding from the same school, contains edifying

pages which shew real loyalty to our great Example, and sincere admiration for His character and teaching. So rich is our inheritance in the Gospel of Christ that the soul can live and thrive, in a fashion, on even the poorest fragment of the truth. But when, as on p. 291, the author tries to persuade us that in a sense 'the Lord is still with us,' we must remind him that his theory completely cuts us off from this source of consolation, as well as from the hope that the Incarnation is in any real sense continued in the life of the Christian Church.

III.—Philosophy of Religion.

Christian and Stoic in the Second Century. By L. Alston. (Longmans, 1906.) 3*s.* net.

We welcome this little book as an interesting and readable exposition of the characteristic differences between these two religious systems. The author disclaims originality; but if he is not original, he yet has a vivid and forcible way of illustrating his points. At times, indeed, his affectation of the epigrammatic style is apt to lead him to put forward somewhat paradoxical propositions, which certainly call for some modification.

We are not quite sure that Mr. Alston's method is the best for approaching the subject. A certain amount of historical introduction is really essential as a *point d'appui.* It is not sufficient merely to state the doctrines and differences of two religions; it is necessary to inquire into their origin and development if we would obtain a clear insight into their radical divergences.

The whole difference between Christianity and Stoicism is ultimately traceable to the conception of God. This the Christian took over from the Jewish idea of a Living God, capable of entering into personal relation with man; and it was this relation between man and God which determined man's attitude to his fellowmen. It is obvious how totally different the conception is from Stoic Pantheism; and it is to this fundamental divergence that all further differences are ultimately traceable. Mr. Alston has, however, left the treatment of this subject to the end of his book, when it should in reality have stood at the very beginning, and all subsequent comparisons between the two systems should have been based on the conclusions thus reached.

The title is slightly misleading. 'The Christian in the Second

Century' is represented by a numerous body—apologists, preachers, visionaries—the Stoic by one single author who, as is well pointed out, 'scratched down rather than wrote out his thoughts.' There were of course modifications of Stoicism no less remarkable than the varieties of Christianity.

We cannot follow the author in all his criticisms either of the imperial philosopher or of the early Christians, to whom at times he barely does sufficient justice (*e.g.* on such questions as 'purity' and 'simplicity'), but nevertheless the book will give genuine pleasure to anyone who, reading it, will welcome a further illustration of the strange paradox of Christianity and Stoicism, that the latter professing to be strong was discovered weak, and the former in dying for others found its own fullest life.

From Epicurus to Christ. A Study in the Principles of Personality. By William de Witt Hyde, President of Bowdoin College. (The Macmillan Co.) 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Side by side with Mr. Alston's book we may set a larger work published in America two or three years ago. Dr. Hyde describes the moral types fostered by the philosophies of Epicurus, the Stoa, Plato, and Aristotle respectively, shewing their merits and defects; and then he explains the spirit of the Christian religion, which unites the strength of all four, while avoiding the weaknesses of each. He has forsaken the chronological order, probably because he considers the system of Epicurus to contain the smallest amount of truth, and that of Aristotle the largest, of the pre-Christian philosophies. It would perhaps have been better to follow the actual course of development; but the defect is a small one. The author has illustrated the tenets of the ancient schools by modern instances. Tito Melema is a good example of Epicureanism of the baser sort, while John Stuart Mill figures as an 'Epicurean heretic.' The defiant endurance of Stoicism is illustrated by the fine lines of Henley, beginning, 'Out of the night that covers me,' and, less happily, by Matthew Arnold. The tendency to unreality in the Stoic's haughty acceptance of adversity is exposed by W. S. Gilbert's comic lines, 'To the Terrestrial Globe.' Emerson is selected as the modern Platonist; Cecil Rhodes and Abraham Lincoln are quoted as the authors of Aristotelian sentiments.

Christianity includes everything of value in Epicureanism—it has its gladness without its exclusiveness; its naturalness without its baseness; its geniality without its heartlessness.

The Christian has the Stoic strength without its hardness; its exaltation without its pride; its integrity without its formalism; its calm without its apathy. Christianity teaches us, as clearly as Plato, how to subordinate the lower in our nature to the higher; but its 'higher' is attainable by the serf as well as by the philosopher. Like Aristotle, Christianity upholds the principle of the devotion of life to a worthy end, and the selection of efficient means for its accomplishment; but the end at which the Christian aims is much higher, and the courage which it demands is much deeper than the duties of a citizen in an aristocratic state.

The chief lesson which these old philosophies may teach us is that we must try to combine the strong points of each. The omission of the Epicurean or the Stoical or the Platonic or the Aristotelian element mutilates and impoverishes the Christian view of life. Asceticism is Christianity minus the truth taught by Epicurus. Sentimental liberalism lacks the Stoic note. Dogmatic orthodoxy is in need of Plato's searchlight of sincerity. Sacerdotal ecclesiasticism is Christianity that has lost the Aristotelian disinterestedness.

Dr. Hyde's view of Christianity is sensible and enlightened, and he has written a book which is pleasant to read, and full of good thoughts.

Philosophical Studies. By DAVID G. RITCHIE, Professor of Logic and Metaphysics at St. Andrews. With a Memoir by PROFESSOR R. LATTA. (London: Macmillan.) 10s. net.

PROFESSOR RITCHIE was a thinker with a marked individuality. The philosopher and the citizen were closely blended in him; and his interest in practical questions gave a freshness and keenness to his intellectual studies. He was a disciple of Hegel, but too original to follow any master slavishly. The chief objects of his polemic were Herbert Spencer on the one hand, and such extreme exponents of Pragmatism as William James and F. C. S. Schiller on the other. The present volume contains several good specimens of his humorous criticism, as when he finds a motto for philosophical pluralism in Stevenson's lines about the world being 'so full of a number of things,' or when he tells the story of the tipsy man, who, hearing St. Paul's clock strike twelve, cried out, 'Can't you let us have all that at once?'—a true mystic, says Ritchie, wishing to transcend the category of time! Students of philosophy will find his critique of Professor Ward's *Naturalism and Agnosticism* very suggestive;

and his vigorous attack upon the 'radical empiricism' of Professor James and his followers is as well timed as it is effective. The pluralism of the American Professor is described as 'the latest important example of brilliant cleverness holding a brief for laziness and stupidity.' We do not explain difficulties by multiplying the number of things to be explained.

Ritchie's religious and theological views occupy a good deal of space in this volume. Though a strong liberal, he was opposed to disestablishment, as a move in the wrong direction—'a falling back on the old anarchical liberalism of the Herbert Spencer type.' He throws out the interesting prediction that disestablishment in Scotland 'would give an enormous increase of members to the Scotch Episcopal Church.' In England he thinks that the Roman Catholics would be the only gainers; 'it would not put the Methodist or Baptist socially in any better position.' Ritchie asked very pertinently why a State should not have as good a right to endow a church as an army.

Christianity must be judged by what it is in its highest form. Origin does not determine value, as the Jews supposed who thought to dispose of Christ's claims by asking, 'Is not this the carpenter's son?' The tree is to be known by its fruits, and not by its roots. Christian theology, he says, is nothing but Platonism applied to the beliefs of the first Christians. The doctrine of the Trinity is a valuable recognition that in the Divine itself there is diversity and not merely abstract unity. Accordingly, he has no quarrel with the Athanasian Creed, which he prefers to the others as being more metaphysical and 'less mythological.' What he calls 'mythology' he attributes to the popular tendency to think of eternal relations as if they were particular events in time, and so to state 'value' in terms of 'origin.' He felt acutely the alienation of orthodox sympathies which these views brought upon him, a 'separation from which there comes so much loss, moral and otherwise.' But what he termed the 'heedlessness of truth in the ecclesiastical mind' repelled him when he wished for a reconciliation. His theological position seems to have been not unlike that of T. H. Green, by whose teaching he was undoubtedly influenced.

Professor Latta has given us a sympathetic biographical sketch of his friend, whose short life was as blameless and honourable as it was distinguished. Ritchie was obliged to give lectures mainly on logic, while his real interests were in ethics and politics; but he was able to convince himself that 'the study of the methods of social science is a necessary part of logic,' and we

can well believe that this latitude of treatment gave additional interest to a somewhat arid subject.

The editor has allowed the Greek quotations to leave his hands in an unscholarly fashion. Blunders or false accents appear on pages 27, 92, 103, 123, 312, 318 (four errors in eight words). In all other ways he has performed his task well.

IV.—Evolution and Anthropology.

Recent Progress in the Study of Variation, Heredity, and Evolution. By R. H. Lock, M.A., Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. (London: Murray, 1906.) *7s. 6d.* net.

Mr. Lock has made a notable contribution to the study of the evolution of biological science. In this, as in other domains of thought, opinions are themselves liable and subject to a process of developmental change. This process was particularly active about half a century ago; the intervening years have seen the entrenchment of the ground then secured, and we seem to be entering now upon a fresh phase, the advanced posts of earlier years becoming in their turn the base for these new operations.

Since Darwin's day, the conception of Evolution as the historical process to which the varied forms of life owe their existence has become, so to speak, common property and common knowledge The process can be observed by any intelligent person who cares to watch the growth of plants from seeds, of the frog from the tadpole. The difficulties of Biology become acute when attention is turned to the discovery of the influences that guide and direct the developing germ on its path. Biologists are to-day engaged in attempting to acquire a fuller knowledge of those influences and factors of development. Variation is a phenomenon soon borne upon the student's notice: the variability affecting each part and every organ, even within a group of animals which to a superficial observer appears homogeneous, is quickly brought to light by the employment of accurate methods of comparison. Moreover, it has long been evident that some variations are perpetuated through transmission from parent to offspring, while others arise and end with the life-history of an individual. In tracing evolutionary processes as affecting forms of life, we are in reality following the history of such variations as are, by some means or other, perpetuated through inheritance. Thus Evolution sustained by Variation and Heredity (as an arch by two pillars), is fitly associated with them in Mr. Lock's masterly review.

The main problems here considered are two in number. First of all, the origin of variations must be investigated: and again the order or rule of their transmission demands inquiry. Mr. Lock points out that two important schools of thought at present dominate research on these subjects, and he deals in turn with the exponents of Biometry, and with those who pursue the methods of investigation with which the name of Abbot Mendel of Brünn will be ever inseparably associated. The two schools are in some respects absolutely opposed, and Mr. Lock's sympathies are not unnaturally engaged by the Mendelians rather than the Biometricians. For the development of Mendelian researches by Mr. Bateson and the pupils he has gathered round him is the great feature of biological activity in Cambridge at the present time.

If we inquire into the results in so far as the fundamental problem of the origin of variation is concerned, we shall not find very much light thrown upon the subject by the workers in Biometry. They, or at least some of them, appear to premise that new forms arise and have arisen from variations of the type described as continuous. Such variations are not as a rule striking in their divergence from the general stock, and in thus laying stress upon the significance of small divergences, Biometricians can claim the support of Darwin himself, whose solicitude for the claims of such comparatively insignificant divergences has never been quite explained, and was a matter of surprise to Huxley.

Mendelians assume an entirely different position. For them, variation as a phenomenon may present two phases, viz. the continuous, where the differences are insignificant; and the discontinuous, where they are strikingly impressive. Curiously enough, the latter and more aberrant variations shew an astonishing tendency in some cases to be inherited. Thus, while unable to demonstrate the mode of origin of either kind of variety, Mendelians distinguish the strongly-transmissible, which they call Mutations, from the less-distinctly inheritable, which they term Fluctuations. The latter appear in some cases to be produced distinctly by alteration in the conditions of life. To Mutations no such definite origin can be ascribed, but with these, on account of their strong tendency to pass from parent to offspring, the Mendelians are at present much concerned.

The differences between the two schools of thought is seen in their methods. The biometric workers deal with large

numbers of individuals, and expressly guard themselves from making a selection of these within the limits of the population they investigate. Any tendency to sampling is deprecated. For the Mendelians, on the other hand, the individual is far more significant, as being the potential founder of a new type, which cannot be swamped. Again, in their results the differences once more assert themselves. Thus Mr. Lock is careful to explain that the chief generalization attained by the biometrical school is the enunciation of a law of ancestral heredity, according to which every ancestor of a particular individual has contributed a quota to his heritable qualities. The followers of Mendel find, on the contrary, that some ancestors may have contributed nothing at all. Yet both modes of thought flourish. Reconciliation might seem distant; nevertheless Mr. Lock is evidently not without hope in this respect, and biologists will welcome the advent of such work as may effect this desirable result.

The pursuit of these two lines of research is the distinctive feature of modern Biology. For this reason it has been thought expedient to attempt, however imperfectly, to give an idea of the two points of view. Lack of space precludes any exposition of the results in detail. Mr. Lock has supplied—we think, most successfully—what was previously a real deficiency. In particular, the most recent results of research on Mendelian lines are clearly stated. The arguments leading to the inference of the segregation of heritable characters in the cells of the sex-glands, the light thrown on otherwise obscure phenomena of the reproductive cycle in various animals, the interpretation of the circumstances of the inheritance of sex, all these are subjects of profound interest, while practical applications, as in the results to the improvement of wheat, are by no means absent. Mr. Lock has condensed an enormous amount of material into a small space, and has done so with success. His treatment of controversial points is eminently fair.

At the Back of the Black Man's Mind: or Notes on the Kingly Office in West Africa. By R. E. Dennett. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1906.) 10*s.* net.

The Lower Niger and its Tribes. By Major A. G. Leonard. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1906.) 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Certainly the perusal of these two books leaves the reader a sadder, if not a wiser man. Both authors have lived many years in West Africa. Both have been impressed with the gross

distortion native ideas and institutions undergo when viewed through European spectacles. Both have acquired a considerable knowledge of the conditions of thought and society obtaining in the special regions of their study. And yet both have failed to make a serious contribution to ethnological science. The cause of this result is not hard to find. Valuable as they are, sympathy, enthusiasm and the collection of information are useless without a careful training in, and a rigid application of, scientific method.

These two books are works rather of art than of science. Each bears the impress not so much of external facts which are universal property, as of the internal feelings and preconceptions, the peculiar property of the author. Mr. Dennett, for example, seeks comparisons between the 'six estates of the British Constitution' on the one hand, and six corresponding estates in the kingdom of the Bavili, north of the Congo mouth, and in the kingdom of Benin, on the other. Thus we are led to see 'the full beauty and use of the kingly office,' and thus it is that

'while in Africa we find the ruins of what were once great kingdoms wanting in strength to maintain themselves for any length of time free from the gravest internal disorders and so degenerating into a series of enclosed despotisms which in anything beyond the management of village affairs do not contain the principle of representation by the people—so, on the other hand, in Europe democracy has become too powerful, and the people, fast losing sight of the great fundamental truths at the base of all good government, look upon licence as liberty and attack or attempt to disestablish any one of the six great estates which endeavours to curb their so-called liberty' (p. 239).

From analogies in ruling offices it is but a small step to analogies in religious thought. The primary object of Mr. Dennett is to 'show that concurrent with fetishism in Jujuism, there is in Africa a religion giving us a much higher conception of God than is generally acknowledged by writers on African modes of thought.' He states that 'this superstition called fetishism is an overgrowth imposed upon the purer knowledge they [the Bavili] once certainly possessed' (p. 168). By fetishism he means 'the doctrine of spirits embodied in or attached to, or conveying influence through, certain material objects' (p. 92). He compares the position of fetishism on the Congo to the relation of popular Buddhism to Buddhistic philosophy.

Interesting and valuable as would be the establishment of such a thesis, no impartial reader can admit that Mr. Dennett has succeeded in his task. Apart from his constant neglect of the suspected influence of early Christian missionaries which he cursorily mentions on pages 2 and 74, Mr. Dennett is always too preoccupied with the axe that he is grinding to sift fact from hypothesis and to resist reading his own interpretation into his observations. To the reviewer, at all events, the following conclusions which the author summarizes in regard to Bini and Bavili philosophy fail to carry conviction.

'We have noted that both the Bini and Bavili in the first place recognise God under the names Oyisa and Nzambi.

'They then recognise that there are two great divisions among things and people. Those created which they connect with God (Oyisa) and those procreated which they connect with the Devil (Eshu) as far as the Bini are concerned, and Bantu Nzambi and Bantua Ndongo so far as the Bavili are concerned. Things of the spirit and things of the body as we should say.

'Then we note that they divide things of the spirit into three parts, and things of the body into three parts or six parts in all.

'Then we have twenty-four powers representing the winds etc., as causative attributes under these two headings.

'After which we have the six formulae, each of twenty-four powers which makes 144 parts in all, *i.e.* seventy-two parts under the spiritual heading and seventy-two parts under the procreating heading.

'And finally we have the twenty-four parts which are the results of the foregoing creative and procreative parts' (pp. 235, 236).

The chapters on law, measures, signs and symbols, on sacred lands, rivers, trees, animals and omens contain many interesting facts, which have been in great part already published by the author in special journals. These facts are of undoubted value, but it is often hard to form an exact estimate of their reliability when the author's preconceptions are so pronounced.

Major Leonard's book on the people of Southern Nigeria suffers not merely from excess of interpretation, but from poverty of fact. He gives us a series of impressionist sketches; the artist is everywhere, but the facts are few and hard to find. Major Leonard must remember that opinions, even of one who claims to have spent ten years in Nigeria, are of small significance in the present state of ethnological science compared with the clear, unvarnished presentation of material. His confidence

in his own power of interpretation is sufficiently shewn by the following extract.

'All through life I have possessed the power of living a life which was positively dual in existence, of having within my own entity the capacity of absolute detachment, from either internal or external surroundings, as the case might be. And it was this power that I utilised to its fullest extent when I was in contact with these sons of Nature, which enabled me to meet them, not merely more than half way, but, in reality, on their own ground or dunghill' (pp. 3, 4).

It is interesting to compare Major Leonard's ideas of the people of the Lower Niger with those of Mr. Dennett already quoted:

'We have before us, in the tribes of the Lower Niger, those of the immediate interior more particularly, a state of society which shows a very early and initial stage of civilisation—a state that consists merely of communities which long ago emerged from a condition of mere animalism into the higher and more intelligent one of human savagery, and from this again to the still more intelligent condition of barbarism, which has advanced no higher, but remained undeveloped, if not fossilised, in every way, mental and physical' (p. 61).

We should have liked space to give an account of Major Leonard's views of religion, his belief, *e.g.*, that 'the greater the growth of civilisation or artificiality, the further the distance from the Omnipotent Almighty' (p. 82), or his belief that 'the child is nearer to the Unknown than the man, and the savage than the civilised adult' (p. 83). We could wish that Major Leonard had been as generous with his facts as with his views. We could then have set a truer value on the latter.

V.—History and Antiquities.

The Church of the Fathers. By Leighton Pullan. (London: Rivingtons, 1905.) 5*s*.

Without disparagement of existing handbooks, it must be said that there has been room for a compact and comprehensive statement of the facts of early Church history. Mr. Pullan has filled the gap admirably. He writes clearly and gracefully without wasted words, and with due regard to proportion. Save that a certain number of minor names are admitted, with inevitable loss of space for more important characters, we cannot criticize his arrangement of the subject, and we must praise the care which he has taken that no topic of interest

should be omitted. The treatment is that of a whole-hearted disciple of Dr. Bright, and while the book has gained by its debt to that excellent master it has also suffered. The Arian controversy is rendered less intelligible than it might be by Mr. Pullan's ignoring of Dr. Gwatkin's great contribution to its history, the recognition of a purely conservative party. It is a pity that this luminous suggestion, which we had thought was by this time generally welcome, should be neglected. It is more serious that the treatment of the great Christological controversy should follow quite traditional lines. The champions of the faith are presented as so thoroughly in the right all through that they are deprived of the credit of having learned fresh truths as the controversy proceeded. Yet though the creed stood at the end of the debate as it stood at the beginning, Christendom was richer by new light upon old verities, and nothing is more instructive than the study of the growth towards deeper and wider views. And this advance was intimately connected with the philosophical thought of the last generations of paganism. As little as the specifically Christian thought of the present day can be isolated from the general tendencies of reflection, so little can the ancient divines be understood without regard to Aristotle and Plato and their successors. On all this Mr. Pullan is provokingly silent, even in regard to St. Augustine, who was nothing if not a metaphysician. But ancient cleavages in belief were connected quite as intimately with national feelings as with schools of philosophy, and here again Mr. Pullan is silent. Finlay for him has written in vain. Nor are we allowed to learn much concerning the popular religion which really won the day against paganism, not without some compromise with it. The strange superstitions and credulities, the strange pieces of theology, such as that doctrine of redemption by almsgiving of which St. Cyprian was sometimes the preacher and which is the whole burden of Salvian's *Ad Ecclesiam*, are so completely ignored as to give almost an appearance of partisanship to Mr. Pullan's work. He seems to desire to recommend one presentation of Christianity to his own generation by laying stress upon selected aspects of the primitive Church, and there is a positiveness, and even an occasional suggestion of pugnacity, in his tone which is controversial rather than historical. A good text book is all the better if it is useless for the purposes of the advocate.

The Political History of England. Vol. IV. From the Accession of Richard II. to the Death of Richard III. (1377–1485). By C. OMAN, Chichele Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford. (London: Longmans, 1906.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.
The Great Revolt of 1381. By the same. (Oxford: at the University Press, 1906.) 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

PROFESSOR OMAN cannot write anything without being extremely interesting; his style is so simple, so vigorous, and at the same time so free from anything like shipshodness; his eye for a battlefield is almost unique (Sir James Ramsay knows *more* about the fifteenth century, but he cannot describe a battle), nay more, the early promise which was given in his little Life of the 'Kingmaker' of becoming a great delineator of character, is more than fulfilled. His 'Richard III', 'Henry IV', and 'Henry V' are perfect models of what character-drawing should be; if his hand is less certain with Cardinal Beaufort, we must remember that that mysterious personage equally eludes everyone else who tries to draw him. Mr. Oman is at home, as no one else who can write is, in the awful wilderness of royal and baronial relationships, marriages and tenures of the fifteenth century. Most of us if suddenly confronted with the question, 'What do you know of the Duke of Exeter, or the Duke of Gloucester, or some such person, in the fifteenth century?' would not be able to go beyond the answer of the immortal schoolboy, 'He was the king's uncle: he was put to death.' But the Professor knows all about them and knows, moreover, how to temper the dose of this knowledge which he has to administer with a due amount of jam. Finally, he is happy in his choice of a century: anyone who has read his *History of England* can see that Constitutional Law is his bugbear; and there was no constitutional law worth speaking of in the days of Lancaster and York.

It was a grisly age. We remember a delightful play at the old 'German Reeds' in which a ghost from that period appeared to his nineteenth century descendant, and asked, 'Who won, Lancaster or York?' 'I don't remember the match,' said the Squire; 'did they play at Lord's or at Prince's?' 'They played at Kings,' said the ghost. 'Ah, well!' said the Squire, 'I think it was drawn.' Professor Oman shews us well how they played at Kings, and how accurately the participle 'drawn' describes the result. There is, in fact, as a whole, only one fault to be found with the book, and it is this: in the Appendix Professor Oman gives an exhaustive and very valuable analysis

of the authorities of the period, and he tells us quite plainly that they are exceptionally meagre and untrustworthy (though he does not suggest, what was perhaps the case, that in such a period as the two Yorkist reigns no chronicler dared to record the truth) ; but then, having to spin a story out of such very poor materials, he never warns us *in the text* that such and such a point rests on very uncertain evidence. To give but one instance of this : he slurs over the difficulty as to what body of men gave, in June 1483, the semblance of accepting the Duke of Gloucester as King Richard III. He calls it an 'Estates' or an 'Assembly,' and seems to imply that it gave some sort of parliamentary sanction to the usurpation ; but we ought either to be told more about it, or to be told that nothing can be known. No doubt there were people in London who had come up to be present at the coronation of Edward V., but, as Mr. Oman tells us, the writs for the Parliament had been countermanded ; and what seems most probable is that this assembly was nothing but a packed body of Richard's friends among the London citizens, an appeal to the whole body of whom had proved fruitless on the day before.

The second book before us, *The Great Revolt of 1381*, is a piece of original work of the highest order. Professor Oman was led to investigate the questions connected with this mysterious outbreak, partly by the publication in the *English Historical Review* of the Anonymous Chronicle of St. Mary's York, written by an eye-witness of the revolt, and partly by the untimely death of a young Frenchman, André Réville, who had begun at the Record Office the transcription of the documents connected with the same. By following up the lines indicated by these documents and the Chronicle, and by diligent study of the Poll-tax rolls themselves he has enabled us entirely to rectify our previous conceptions of the causes and results of the outbreak, on which that very dictatorial person Mr. Thorold Rogers believed that he had said the last word. Professor Oman is not one who takes his opinions from others ; he is not afraid to say that insurgents who profess to be rising for liberty are sometimes a worthless *canaille*, that governments may be sometimes in the right, that Churchmen are generally harder landlords than laymen. He is wise enough to know that we need seek for no recondite reasons to explain a general outbreak of arson, robbery and murder, if once government is paralyzed. So it was in 1381, and so it would be, were the same paralysis to overtake a modern government, in 1907. Most happily, too, he has been able to

illustrate from the story of the former year the truth enunciated by Herbert Spencer, 'The more conditions are ameliorated, the more they are declared to be intolerable.' It was not where Serfdom was most grievous, or grievous at all, that the revolt was worst, but where the labourers were fat and prosperous and wanted to be rid of a few vexatious relics of their former condition. Above all, Professor Oman makes quite clear to us that the Poll-tax of 1381 was only the match that fired the train; anarchy had been in its birth-throes for some years past. The nation was doggedly set on maintaining the French conquests of Edward III., but would not, or could not, find the wealth necessary for the task. Ever since the 'Black Death' strikes and combinations of labourers had been continuous, and the demagogic inciter to strikes was never far off. Among the people who most deserved a hanging, but who unfortunately were let off, were two aldermen of London, who actually admitted the mob to the city and exhorted them to every kind of violence. The seeds of anarchy had not all been ripening in one pod nor on one stem; in the great towns there was jealousy of 'foreigners,' jealousy between rich and poor; in the lesser towns there was clamour for fresh privileges to be granted; everywhere there was hatred of Churchmen and especially of rich abbots, hatred of small manorial fines, *corvées*, *banalités*, hatred of lawyers. But there was no Wycliffite influence at work; the religious fomenters of the insurrection were either madmen like John Ball, who had been trying to foment it for the past twenty years, or friars who were Wycliffe's bitterest enemies. The avowed object of the rioters' hatred was the good but feeble old Archbishop Sudbury, the very man who refused to persecute heretics. (He might have been canonized as a martyr, as the Professor shews us, had he been a persecutor.)

Two great discoveries are wholly due to this latest inquiry into the subject: (1) The number of false returns sent in to the Poll-tax; this was so great and so unblushing that the Government ordered a special commission of inquiry on it. To the Poll-tax of 1377, 1,355,000 names had been returned; four years later the Government was astonished to find that there were not 900,000 persons in England over fifteen years of age! In a few weeks the commissioners collected in Suffolk alone 13,000 suppressed names. (2) The 'merciless repression which followed' the close of the revolt has been utterly exaggerated; some 110 executions can be traced, and there may have been a few more; but even Stubbs was not afraid to speak (without a

shadow of evidence) of ' thousands.' Professor Oman has blown all this to the winds.

For the way in which he tells the dramatic story no praise can be too high. The fourth chapter, descriptive of the scene in Smithfield, where the young king faced the rioters, is worthy to rank with the finest pieces of historical writing in the English language. Richard, who was to develop into a hesitating weakling before his end, shewed himself at the opening of his reign one of the greatest kings that ever lived—for he, almost alone of kings in history, faced and vanquished, by sheer courage and readiness, a seething armed mob bent upon the overthrow of himself and of society.

A History of the Inquisition in Spain. By Henry Charles Lea, LL.D. In four volumes. Vols. I. and II. (New York and London: The Macmillan Co. 1906.) 10*s.* 6*d.* each *net.*

The Spanish Inquisition is the standing example of the success of persecution if efficiently applied. These two volumes shew admirably the means by which this efficiency was from the first secured. Mere divergence of doctrine would hardly have been a sufficient justification for the tyranny of the Holy Office, had there not also been at the outset racial cleavage. The unusual strength of the Jews in Spain early provoked the hostility of the Church. Official persecution and popular fanaticism culminated in their wholesale expulsion in 1492. Meanwhile, however, the previous remedy of forced conversion was proving more dangerous than the disease. In order to exercise their professions, retain their property, or protect their lives the Jews had in thousands professed Christianity. Their ability rapidly took these *Conversos* to the front in Church and State. They filled the great sees and high offices at Court; their wealth tempted the first families of the land to intermarriage. The Spanish nobility was becoming tainted by Hebrew blood, and possibly by Jewish doctrines. Many of the *Conversos* were naturally bad Christians, nursing their old beliefs, and hoping, perhaps, for the day of deliverance. Judaism consisted so largely in the practices of everyday private life that it was especially difficult to detect, except by the aid of servants and near relations. It was to meet this peculiar national danger that the Spanish Inquisition was established with all its mysterious and terrifying agencies. It was essential to success that the

accused should be ignorant of the sources of evidence, that they should be deprived of all the ordinary safeguards of the law.

Having explained the origins Dr. Lea passes on with masterly treatment of detail to describe the organization and methods of the Holy Office, its relation to the other elements of the State, its unscrupulous advance towards privilege and pre-eminence, and the chronic hatred excited by its tyranny in all the Spanish possessions of the Crown. Its strength lay in its original organization, in its intensely national character and in its effective centralization under the Inquisitor General and the small Council, called the *Suprema*, which was an integral factor of the Constitution and in immediate and constant contact with the monarchy. The King nominated the Inquisitor General, and though his authority was a delegation from the Pope and he could not, therefore, be dismissed, yet the Crown possessed the means of enforcing resignation. The Suprema in turn had the appointment of all the tribunals and officials throughout Spain ; it was strong enough to protect or avenge them, and though it might secretly reprimand, it never allowed its lowliest servants to be publicly disgraced. Thus armed, the Inquisition was able to override the jurisdiction and privilege of the feudal nobles and of the Military Orders ; it was almost invariably victorious in its conflicts with the less highly organized ecclesiastical courts, and even with the powerful bureaucracy of the legal classes which centred in the Council of Castile. The civil officials fought courageously and were frequently excommunicated. The King was their national protector, but he usually threw his weight upon the other side, until the advent of the Bourbons produced a distinct reaction. The waste of power entailed by long and embittered contests on trivial matters was fully recognized, and many attempts were made to arrive at a satisfactory Concordat, but when made it was never respected by the Inquisition.

In every department the law of the land was summarily set at naught, for the Suprema was a law to itself, legislating, judging, administering and virtually taxing. Like the ecclesiastical courts in earlier days, it withdrew all classes of offences, which had the remotest connexion with matters of faith, from the ordinary courts ; it claimed exclusive jurisdiction over its own officials and servants, whether clerical or lay, in all cases either criminal or civil. Its wealth was great, for not only did it arbitrarily impose enormous fines for very slight offences, but in defiance of the admitted rights of the Crown it retained the products of the confiscations, while at times it

even obtained from the Pope a grant of Church property. It is true that in the financial distress of Spain under Philip IV. the Crown turned greedily to the hoarded or annual resources of the Inquisition. With greater or less success members claimed exemption from national and local taxation, even from the much cherished inter-provincial duties at the 'dry ports.' In town markets they demanded the right of priority of purchase, and such perquisites as the offal of beasts killed, insisting, indeed, that if this were inadequate to their needs, additional beasts should be killed for the purpose. They set up shops which undersold or drew custom from the recognized tradesmen, while many of these became Familiars or minor officials to escape payment of debts, to collect claims, or to avoid customs dues. Municipal police regulations and royal sumptuary laws were alike loftily disregarded. Servants of the Inquisition were withdrawn from military service, and objected to the billetting of troops, while they clamoured for the right of bearing arms, which was stringently forbidden by repeated laws. This latter claim was the more unnecessary, as their persons were inviolable, and even an insult to the lowest menial entailed ruinous consequences. Spain was the paradise of etiquette, and precedence was everyone's ideal. In this respect the Holy Office was not uniformly successful. Local tribunals assumed precedence over viceroys and captain-generals, but these were direct representatives of the Crown, and Philip II. sharply rapped the knuckles of the claimants. In the churches quarrels on the right of precedence as between Episcopal and Inquisitorial notices were frequent, and occasionally one was gabbled against the other, or excommunication was drowned by the organ, the choir and congregational outcry. Here the bishops held their own better than in the matter of jurisdiction.

So far we have dealt with the material of Dr. Lea's first volume. The second, published a little later, is divided into four books, relating respectively to jurisdiction, organization, resources and practice. This division seems to entail some redigging of ground already trenched. The successful struggle of the oligarchy of the Suprema with the monarchical instincts of the Inquisitor General on the one hand, and with the subordinate tribunals on the other, might with advantage have come earlier. So much is heard from the first of the unique character of the Familiars, that that admirable chapter would have been welcome at a previous stage. This, moreover, leads directly to one of the most interesting dissertations in these

volumes: the craze, that is, for *limpieza*, for purity of blood from Jewish, Moorish or heretical taint. This was early made a qualification for the Familiars, and the mania spread to the monasteries and Military Orders, the chapters and universities, until all important professions and offices were barred to those who could not shew an immaculate genealogy. The one high office for which *limpieza* was not definitely required was, curiously enough, that of the Inquisitor General! This craze was the more absurd as Cardinal Mendoza was probably right in representing to Philip II. that virtually the whole nobility of Castile and Aragon had a strain of Jewish blood. Only the very poor, and the gentry of the roughest mountainous districts of the north and east were quite honestly 'Old Christians.' The taint on the descendants of those who were penanced, however slightly, for heretical or purely moral causes, was of course later. Not one of the results of the Inquisition was more disastrous to the intellectual progress of Spain than this. Yet even till 1860 *limpieza* was requisite for admission to the corps of cadets, and is still believed to be a source of trouble in Majorca.

The questions of jurisdiction here treated turn mainly on the determination to bring the bishops within the power of the Inquisition, and the pivot is the *cause célèbre* of Archbishop Carranza, which receives very full treatment. No reasonable man can doubt that this most excellent of prelates was innocent of heresy, a muddled theologian though he might be. His Commentaries, indeed, remained on the Index until 1900, but they were approved by the Council of Trent, by Pius IV., and by Pius V., who, but for his own untimely death, would undoubtedly have acquitted him. Carranza had warm sympathy in Spain, and his case was a crying scandal throughout Europe; yet for nearly seventeen years he was a prisoner, and this merely to gratify private spite and self-interest in the first case, then the self-pride of the Suprema. The affair evidently weakened the position of the bishops, but the victory of the Inquisition was not definitive. Nor is this surprising when the unusual strength of the Spanish episcopate is considered: strength which was much in evidence during the Council of Trent at this very period. The Papacy itself was no more fortunate, for the struggle against appeals to Rome continued from the earliest days of the Inquisition to the eighteenth century. In this the Crown was whole-heartedly on the side of the Suprema, as, indeed, was probably the nation. If the later

and weaker Habsburgs occasionally wavered, the Bourbons lost no time in clinching the claims of the Inquisition.

The resources of the Inquisition are scheduled by Dr. Lea as consisting of confiscations, fines and penances, dispensations, and benefices. This latter extremely important source was due to the skill of Valdés, who in 1559 extracted from the Papacy a brief suppressing one canonry and one prebend in all Cathedral and Collegiate churches, the revenue being applied in perpetuity to the Inquisition. Nor was this all, for the officials were richly endowed with benefices, and granted dispensation from residence, in spite of the honourable traditions of the Spanish Church in this respect, and the courageous and persistent resistance of the Chapters.

Readers will naturally look for the more thrilling and sensational features of the Inquisition in Book VI. upon its practice. This, we venture to think, would have been improved by the inclusion of the chapter on the Edict of Faith, that solemn and ceremonious exhortation to delation which proved so ruinous to Spanish character. The Edict seems awkwardly placed between the conflicts with the Bishops and the Papacy, whereas its natural connexion is with the Edict of Grace, which was the official encouragement to dissidents to inform against themselves. The inquisitorial process follows, and this includes the inviolable secrecy in which the procedure was shrouded, and which was doubtless the main factor in its power. This secrecy was well called in quite recent times the soul of the Holy Office. Arrest was followed by sequestration of all the accused's property pending his trial, and by the secret prison, the most terrible feature of which was the deprivation of the Sacraments. Apart from this Dr. Lea admits that the prisons compared somewhat favourably with those of the secular authorities, although the execution of humane instructions varied with the characters of local officials, while public opinion had no outlet. Where, however, the Inquisition fell far below the standard of the worst contemporary Courts was in the admission of evidence. Every conceivable limitation was placed on the witnesses for the accused, whereas no restrictions, except the fact of a private quarrel, affected those for the prosecution, which welcomed the evidence of the nearest relations, of Jews, of children or even lunatics. The suppression of such witnesses' names contributed to make successful defence impossible. Wholesale false witness was the natural result, and each successive generation of Spaniards was reared in an atmosphere of spying, tale-bearing and perjury.

The very conscience was poisoned from the outset by the gross abuses of the confessional for the purposes of the Holy Office.

Dr. Lea proves that from its origin to its very close in the nineteenth century the Inquisition provoked bitter hostility and much actual resistance. This resistance was more open and continuous in the provinces of the Crown of Aragon, where popular institutions long flourished, but it seems to have been scarcely more effectual than in Castile. Why, then, did a high-spirited nation tolerate the tyranny? The scruples imposed by the oath to support the Holy Office which was taken by every functionary from the King downwards must count for something; fear of the consequences of resistance for much more. Terrorism was created by the abuse of excommunication or arrest, by the impossibility of defence, by the eternal infamy of the accused's posterity. Moreover, in spite of hostility, few Spaniards really wished the Inquisition abolished. It was a national institution worked by Spaniards to meet dangers almost exclusively Spanish. The appointment of the German Jesuit Nithard as Inquisitor General under Charles II. provoked the only widespread outbreak. It was worth some sacrifice to boast that, while other nations were rent by religious strife, Spain alone preserved her peace and her unity of faith. The ultimate intellectual consequences were naturally not apparent. It is as difficult for nations as for individuals to recognize their intellectual decline. After all, Protestant Germany in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries could shew nothing which could approach the glorious literary and artistic products of Inquisition-ridden Spain.

The Manor and Manorial Records. By N. J. Hone. (London: Methuen and Co., 1906.) *7s. 6d.*

The subject of the Manor, its origin, its administration, and its relation to agriculture, is so vast and as yet so incompletely worked out that it is impossible to give a short and satisfactory account of it. Mr. Hone has faced the difficulty with as much success as any of his predecessors. He is at his best in the point which interests him most, the legal machinery; in regard to the rural life of earlier times he is somewhat indefinite, perhaps from want of familiarity with that of our own day. And we must complain of an occasional want of precision both in thought and in expression. But the plan of his book is good, and his examples well chosen. He begins with a brief history of the

manor, leaning to the conclusions of Vinogradoff; it is curious that he does not cite that passage in the Epistle of Bede to Egbert which is the most instructive of all statements concerning the foundation of manors in England. Mr. Hone's survey is wide, but hardly wide enough; he is not aware that in the counties of Nottingham and Dorset, if not in others, there are unenclosed parishes with the three-field system still at work. And his own experience has led him to generalize without sufficient warrant. He regards a demesne scattered among the strips of the yardlands as normal, and no doubt in the records he has studied demesnes thus dispersed have prevailed; but desmesnes in separate and compact blocks are probably as common. He also lays down that free suitors were necessary to constitute a court; but the numerous examples of 'John Freeland, free tenant,' a relation of Doe and Roe, shews that this was only a theoretical requisite and that a legal fiction sufficed in lieu of real men. The account of the arrangement of arable fields is good so far as it goes, but it is too brief to be instructive, and many of the words which are likely to puzzle a beginner are overlooked; 'selion' is omitted in the index, and 'olyard' is altogether neglected. The passages from court rolls are well chosen and well translated, though of course on some points there might be dispute, but they are not sufficiently annotated to help the very readers to whom the book will be most useful. And a good deal that is most interesting is not strictly relevant to the purpose of the book; information is given at length concerning the domestic management of a religious house, concerning popular festivals and the like, which does not help us to understand how manors arose or how they were administered, nor is a very strict line drawn between borough and village. Mr. Hone gives ample proof that certain religious houses were very easy landlords; historical justice required that he should furnish evidence of the extreme unpopularity of others. On the important question of the disappearance of the old system of husbandry he has injured his work by repetition. At two distant points of the book he treats of the matter, with some inconsistency and some waste of space, and fails to give a consecutive account. The obvious consideration of the value of some land for pasture, as in Blackmore Vale, has not struck him. In such districts moderate corn land was turned into rich grass at a very early date; the process was as inevitable as that by which the greensand of Bedfordshire is now being converted from the growth of cereals to that of

vegetables. It would be both easy and interesting to trace the disappearance of common fields in different parts at different times, and to connect it with economic considerations. Almost a third of the book is taken up with lists of manuscript material in a few of the chief libraries and in the Record Office. This information is not of an inaccessible kind, and could only be justified by appearing as part of a fairly complete catalogue. But while the rolls in the Bodleian are enumerated, those in the Cambridge Library are ignored, and no mention is made of the rich stores of the older colleges in both Universities. The local names, always a difficult matter, are too often misprinted; a fault which this volume shares with others of the series of 'The Antiquary's Books.' However, it is unkind to make too much of the faults of an interesting and instructive book on a difficult subject. All its readers will profit by it, and those not least who have a previous acquaintance with the subject.

Chertsey Abbey. By Lucy Wheeler. (London: Wells Gardner, 1905.) 6*s*.

This is one of those books, well intentioned, nicely printed and prettily illustrated, about which it is kindest to say as little as possible. The progress of the *Victoria History of the English Counties* will, we hope, soon bring them to an end. The writer's single qualification for her task is a laudable admiration for the interesting place of which she treats. She has consulted a fair number of authorities without knowing how to use them, and in fact without any such general acquaintance with English history and ecclesiastical antiquity as to render them intelligible to her. When she is not in error she fumbles her subject vaguely and helplessly. The Latin is as extraordinary as might be expected, and we are not surprised at the absence of references. In most parts of England it is difficult to obtain skilled assistance in such a task, but Chertsey is within a walk of the Royal Holloway College, where the best of guidance is attainable and where the opportunity of applying sound general knowledge to the elucidation of local history would almost certainly have been seized with eagerness. But with all its faults the book contains a good many facts which are of interest concerning one of the most venerable sites in England, and a competent reader will be instructed as well as irritated. A curious preface is contributed by Mr. Justice Swinfen Eady, in which he says that the book contains a 'full history' of the Abbey, and cites Capgrave as an original authority for the life of St. Erkenwald.

A Memoir of Archbishop Markham. By Sir CLEMENTS MARKHAM, K.C.B. (Oxford: at the University Press, 1906.) 5*s*.

WE are grateful for any information concerning the Church in the days of George III. We may read as much as we will of the Methodist and Evangelical movements, but of the lives and views of the Church's leaders, except in so far as they came into contact or collision with the freelances, we can learn little from current literature and that little is usually in a tone of conventional disparagement. Sir Clements Markham had an excellent opportunity of enlightening us in the Life which he has written of his distinguished ancestor. But though his account of the early struggles and early success of the Archbishop is interesting, and though we see something of that hunt for preferment which prevailed in England in a much milder form than in other countries with ancient ecclesiastical endowments, yet of the Church policy of the Archbishop we learn nothing. He occupied two sees from 1771 to 1807 and in that memorable period must have addressed many Charges to the clergy; the use which he made of his patronage, in cases when he was not advancing his own relatives or his old pupils at Westminster, would have taught us what his bias was; there must be numerous references in the theological literature of the day to so prominent an ecclesiastic. But Sir Clements has taken no interest in this, the really significant part of the Archbishop's life. We have instead a number of details which can only be of interest to the Markham family, such as the names of forty-five kinsmen who subscribed to put up a memorial in Westminster Abbey to the Archbishop, with the amount of their subscriptions; we have also an account, which adds little to what is already accessible, of his somewhat stormy political life and of his connexion with Burke and the Prince of Wales. But the book casts many incidental lights upon the ways and thoughts of the age, none of which is more striking than the account of the struggles of the Archbishop's father as a half-pay officer. He copied papers for solicitors and painted fan-mounts which he sold in disguise in the streets. In his poverty he is the exact counterpart of the hero of *Amelia*, and is a proof, if it were needed, of the photographic accuracy with which Fielding has depicted some aspects of the reign of George II. Serious as its omissions are, the book is always interesting and is worthy of its distinguished author and of its subject. But in view of the good fortune of his own family we could wish that he had solved

for us the curious problem why York has been so much more successful than Canterbury in founding houses of landed estate.

A History of Modern England. By HERBERT PAUL. Vol. V. (London: Macmillan.) 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

WHEN Dr. Johnson wrote the last *Idler* he told us, in some of the most stately and pathetic words in the English language, of the sadness inseparable from the thought of doing anything for the last time. With Mr. Paul's last volume before us for review, we are bound, in loyalty to the great Doctor, to confess that we are sad. But we must also be loyal to truth, and we have therefore to acknowledge that our regret that we have come to the end is small when we compare it with our disappointment. Mr. Paul is not the first writer who has failed to sustain a fairly high level of excellence when he has attempted to describe events close at hand. But there is an exceptionally large difference of merit between his opening and closing volumes. There was a little more flavour of the historian at the beginning; then we found ourselves with a journalist; and we end on the floor of the House of Commons, and even on the less dignified platform of the electioneer. We do not blame Mr. Paul because he is in the thick of modern politics. But such a man cannot write a book that deserves to be called a history, if he brings it down to the last decade. At the same time, if we take Mr. Paul's writing as we take his speeches, he is lively enough to be entertaining, and quite content enough with his own opinion upon all subjects to arouse the interest and opposition of his readers, as well as, we must suppose, the admiration of his political associates, We need not comment on the leading topics of this last volume, on Home Rule, or Lord Salisbury's foreign policy, on the fall of Mr. Parnell, or the resignation of Lord Randolph Churchill, or Mr. Gladstone's farewell. But as political memory is so short every reader would do well to look at Mr. Paul's account of the arrival of free education in 1891. His chapter on the triumph of ritualism recognizes that a grave constitutional issue lay beneath the Bell-Cox case, and he deals briefly with the case of the reredos at St. Paul's and the trial of the Bishop of Lincoln. The church connected with the last case is incorrectly described by Mr. Paul. It was St. Peter's-at-Gowts, and Gowts means sluices.

An index to the whole work is added to this volume, by which any leading topic can be traced through the second half of the last century, and Mr. Paul's 'conclusion' with its final tone of acceptable imperialism, is not unworthy of him.

VI.—General Literature.

The Bookman Illustrated History of English Literature. By Thomas Seccombe and W. Robertson Nicoll. 2 vols. (London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1906.) 15*s.* net.

So far as we are aware this is distinctly the best popular work on English literature that has so far been put before the public. It is in two folio volumes, from Chaucer to Dryden, and from Pope to Swinburne respectively. The editor of the *Bookman*, Dr. W. Robertson Nicoll, has entrusted them to Mr. Thomas Seccombe, who with an admirable and taking style, and facile pen carries us swiftly along through 522 pages, in which the story of our literature is shewn to be continuous, and those who have made it are conjured up before us with life-like presentment and clear delineation. Though intentionally a popular book, it is popular in the best sense, appealing to the student as well as to the general reader, since it has the advantage of being thoroughly up to date, and of containing the results of special research. On disputed points we find ourselves generally in agreement with the views which Mr. Seccombe puts forward or adopts, and, where argument is necessary, his remarks are made in judicious language which has the ring of honest conviction, arrived at by original investigation. The value of the book to the student is increased by the footnotes, and by the critical summaries appended to many of the chapters. In both, the bright, attractive style of the main narrative is kept up, and the eye of the reader glides from the larger to the smaller print, without any sense of having fallen from interesting description to dry-as-dust annotation. The generalizations and summaries strike us as well-advised. We may refer to those on Macaulay, pp. 429–430, Matthew Arnold, pp. 506–507, and Walter Pater, p. 508, as samples of individualities oftenest brought to the bar of miscellaneous and general criticism.

The book is thoroughly sound and healthy in tone from beginning to end, and is the work of one who knows and loves what he is writing about. The student of special sections will find, often what may be new to him, always something so put as to be worth remembering. Nowhere will this assertion be found more true than in the chapters where most readers may expect to find themselves on familiar ground—the Elizabethan age. The chapter on Shakespeare is particularly fascinating, and will probably be the most popular in the book. It will bear reading many times over, and it is only fair to say that every

other part of the two volumes is equally well written. The style is clear, engaging, happy in metaphor and suggestion, and uninterruptedly pleasing.

Where there is so much to praise, it may seem ungenerous to carp at details, but there is one point to which we must call attention. The author is very fond of using sparkling Gallicisms, and for the most part they fit well into his congenial style. In the second volume they come pretty thickly, and here and there they need revision. For example, on pp. 411–412, we find 'cavalier servante,' on p. 413 (footnote), 'revoltés,' on p. 427, 'resumés.' These may be 'fautes d'impression,' but what shall we say of 'menus plaisiris,' on p. 414? Is not this, apart from the printer's error, the French for 'pocket-money'? Should it not be 'menus propos,' 'small talk'? And why should Villon masquerade as 'Françoise'? Again, at Pisa, the official spelling of 'Lung' Arno,' p. 412 and elsewhere, is 'Lung-arno.' Also, on p. 399, in a list of De Quincey's works we find 'Casuistry of Roman *Morals*' usurping the place of 'Casuistry of Roman Meals.' No doubt these small points will be set right in the next edition.

The fifty-one beautiful full-page photogravures, make the book in view of its size remarkably cheap, and we thank Mr. Seccombe for the pleasure his work has given us.

Edward FitzGerald. By A. C. Benson, Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge. 'English Men of Letters' series. (London: Macmillan, 1905.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

On this little biography as much skill in the handling and distinction of style have been expended as would justify a larger book. It is not exactly cheerful reading. FitzGerald, though Celt or Norman rather than Saxon, belonged to the tribe of eccentrics, lovable odd fellows, 'characters,' or even 'quizzes,' that used to be taken as peculiarly English in the days of Voltaire and Goldsmith. Our pretentious modern speech would call him, truthfully enough, a decadent or an anarchist; for he was idle, unfit to make a living, lawless, and not to be managed by authority in any shape. He wasted years in trifling, married without love on a sort of punctilio, dressed and lounged like Diogenes, hid away in a den where he smoked and read the classics down by the wild North Sea, and just wrote a letter or scribbled at a translation when the fit took him. Yet he was tender-hearted, not cynical; and Thackeray, Tennyson, even grim old Carlyle, returned the affection he somehow insisted on

their sharing. All this would not have made him famous. But, by one of the strangest freaks in literature, FitzGerald, pottering about among Persian rhymers, and not half understanding them, stumbled upon the quatrains of Omar Khayyam. By magic touches he so transformed that mediæval astronomer-sceptic as to do for him what no other English versifier has done for any exotic poet, and Omar can never henceforth cease to be quoted in our Golden Treasury as a native singer. Thousands are well up in his 'Rubaiyat' who know about Persian not a syllable more than FitzGerald has chanted to them; but so much they know by heart, and in a defiant mood believe, taking the music for gospel.

If a gain to English letters, that happy *tour de force* cannot be thought of without misgivings. It just enabled the average foolish person to say in his heart 'There is no God.' And saying it so daintily, with such ingenious yet simple turns, the holiday-maker fancied himself original. But it was 'old Fitz,' not the London clubman, who shewed originality: once and once only, as Mr. Benson well remarks; for the translations from Calderon or Æschylus fail precisely where Omar triumphs: they have no blood in their veins. FitzGerald's diffidence, trembling shyness before the shadow of reality, yearning after love, sentimentalism, sharp insight, caprice, perverseness, these things which remind us of the illustrious failures of Gray, Senancour, Amiel, according to the aspect in which we regard our hermit, find excellent definition here. The chapters on 'Criticism' and 'Habits and Character' tell us all we need remember of one whose judgements were penetrating or subtle, but often narrow, pettish, unreasoning. This doubter and deserter from the battle of men, skulking in dark corners, timid as Gray, whom he admired, freakish as Charles Lamb, whose writings pleased him more and more, leaves upon us a sense of futility, regret, almost, at certain crises, of contempt, but in the end of boundless pity. Does he prove anything at all? Perhaps that literature is not the key to life; and surely that faith alone leads to action.

Walter Pater. By A. C. Benson. 'English Men of Letters' Series. (London: Macmillan and Co. 1906.) *2s. 6d. net.*

Mr. Benson has exercised a wise discrimination in giving us a chronological and critical description of Pater's works rather than a biography of the man. For in such a biography, what would there have been to say? Pater was educated like most well-to-do young Englishmen; he gained a Second Class and was

a somewhat ineffective College Tutor; he was satirized in the 'New Republic'; he passed his time between Oxford and London, with occasional travels in Italy and elsewhere; he never married; he died somewhat suddenly in 1894; and that is nearly all. Yet in himself, especially in the 'self' exhibited in his works, he was an intensely interesting man; a man of well-defined limitations (for he cared nothing for science or politics, and, within the sphere of literature, was but slenderly endowed with the dramatic instinct); but, within those limitations, of very high mental and spiritual endowments.

After his 'artistic conversion,' on his first visit to Italy, his interest in metaphysics (originally his favourite study) gradually slackened, except so far as they could be made to bear on art or on personality. For it was the moral and intellectual beauty of art, its influence on character in the largest sense of the word, that was his constant subject. This it was which constituted his message to his generation. In the words of his biographer, he learned (and therefore taught others) 'to see, with an impassioned zest, the truth that in art, and life alike, the victory is with those who attain to a certain patient and appreciative attitude of soul; who learn through careful toil . . . to discriminate between what is facile, impressive, specious, and what is deep, permanent, sincere.' We are told that his knowledge of Italian art was 'superficial.' Probably 'partial' and 'limited' would be better epithets; for his studies of painters were careful and thorough. They were not, however, technical; and Mr. Benson justly says that wrong attributions of pictures to painters, which are not uncommon with him, really affect very little the value of his work.

But, after all, it is in his literary style that his supreme excellence consists. Based partly on French, partly on English models, it became eventually a thoroughly individual possession, instinct with meaning, beauty, and poetry. It was not perfect; for it was artificial, often involved, and generally wanting in directness and simplicity. What he thought prose ought to be, what no doubt he aimed at himself, he shews us where he describes a style 'austere, ornate, argumentative, fanciful, yet true from first to last to the vision within.' But style, however individual, is liable to be deflected from its course—to shew signs of foreign influence. Pater, we are rightly told, had nothing in common with Carlyle; and yet it is not difficult occasionally to recognize a touch of Carlylese. He himself

declined to read Stevenson and Rudyard Kipling, believing that their styles were strong, and 'they might lead me out of my path.' Mr. Benson, again, has an easily recognizable style; yet in this book it is hard to think that it has not been affected by its subject. We cannot, for instance, believe that if he had been writing on another theme he would have talked of 'a tender aloofness, a spectacular dreamfulness.'

Walter Pater was a high-minded man, of simple life, devoted to authorship as his work of life, and deeply impressed with his responsibility as an author. His attitude to the Christian religion is rather difficult to understand. He was sincerely attached to it; he accepted it as an inspiration of life; but, at the same time, dogma in his mind was hardly rated higher than a 'possibility.' Religion, however, was by no means the only sphere of thought in which ideas were more to him than facts.

Altogether Mr. Benson has produced an excellent book—appreciative and suggestive. His *obiter dicta* set one thinking, though one cannot always agree with them. For instance, it is an imperfect description of Gothic architecture to describe it as 'beauty feeling its way out of barbarism into a certain ecclesiastical and traditional grace.' We should like also to suggest to him that the young athletes whom he sees around him at Cambridge, whatever their limitations, are at least neither 'gloomy' nor 'commercial.' What, again, is the exact meaning (p. 82) of 'haunted emphasis'? And what is the difference (p. 202) between 'pontifical' and 'sacerdotal'? and why is it, apparently, right to be the first and wrong to be the second? These, however, are small matters, and do not diminish our gratitude to the writer for performing with such success a difficult task: difficult, because the usual resources of a biographer are wanting, and because the charm of the subject, though very real, is so subtle and so elusive.

Life of S. Teresa. Written by herself. Translated from the Spanish by David Lewis. Third edition, enlarged. With additional Notes and an Introduction by Rev. Fr. Benedict Zimmerman. (London: T. Baker.) 8*s.* net.

The latest edition of this well-known translation differs only from its predecessors in having the advantage of Father Zimmerman's interesting introduction and the arguments of the chapters written by St. Teresa herself. Lesser mortals have so long been strangers to the spirit of humble detachment (at all events to the same degree)

that they feel a shock in reading that the Saint describes certain chapters as 'most profitable and noteworthy,' and containing 'excellent doctrine,' and have hastily assumed that, since it appears to them unsaintly so to write, St. Teresa cannot so have written. The publication in 1873, at Madrid, of a photographic reproduction of the Saint's autograph has, however, proved that they were mistaken. How far more clearly than they, St. Teresa understood the Apostolic injunction 'not to think of ourselves more highly than we ought to think, but to think soberly,' is proved by her writing these arguments in the first place; and, in the second, by her having drawn her pen, with touching *naïveté*, through such expressions as 'In an excellent manner,' 'This is most admirable,' which appear scored through in the MS. The photographic reproduction further reveals that nearly a thousand inaccuracies have crept into the edition followed by Mr. Lewis. Most of them, Father Zimmerman allows, are immaterial, but it seems unfortunate that his agreement with the owners of the copyright should preclude his correcting them by the authentic version, binding him, as it does, to reproduce exactly the text and notes of Mr. Lewis without any change.

Father Zimmerman calls attention to various interesting points which have been established recently, one of the more important being the real date of St. Teresa's profession, now proved to have been made on November 3, 1536, two years later than the date generally given. St. Teresa's habit of communicating once a fortnight has been ascribed by Mr. Lewis to the laxity of the convent, and not, as is the case, to the infrequency of communions in those days, when once a month was the rule for a good religious. Thankful as we may rightly be for the excellence of Mr. Lewis' translation, a preference for accuracy cannot be wholly satisfied until careful collation with the original has produced, if not an improved, an authentic, edition.

A History of English Poetry. By W. J. Courthope, C.B. Vol. V. (London: Macmillan & Co. 1905.) 10*s.* net.

The fifth volume of Mr. Courthope's history brings him to that period in our literature with which his own name is principally associated, the period of the eighteenth century of which the protagonist is Pope. In this period Mr. Courthope sees at once the full development of the Classical Renaissance which began as far back as the fourteenth century, and the literary counterpart of the Whig victory of 1688. We cannot profess ourselves fully in accord here with his philosophy of literature. The principle is laid down that 'the Renaissance stimulates artistic invention

in free communities, but overlays national originality with imitated classic forms in States deprived of their political freedom.' It will probably not be disputed that England in the eighteenth century was a free community; nevertheless we suspect that to most readers the second clause in the sentence just quoted will seem to give a truer description of the literature of that period than the first. This, however, is not Mr. Courthope's view. He regards the Elizabethan and Stuart literature as representing a conflict between mediæval and classical elements, ending with the triumph of the latter, to which we owe a great age of constructive development, the results of which will bear comparison with those of the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. In particular, he appropriates to the school of Pope, and especially to Goldsmith, Mr. S. H. Butcher's panegyric on the Attic style at its best.

In spite of this lofty estimate, which will hardly be universally accepted, Mr. Courthope's presentation of the various poets with whom he has to deal in this volume cannot be called unduly eulogistic. The services which they rendered to English literature, by purging it of obscure turgidity and strained conceits, and by establishing a standard of plain colloquial idiom, are indisputable, and are not over-emphasized in themselves; but what we seem to miss is a recognition of the fact that clearness of expression and mastery of colloquial idiom are not the heart of the whole matter, and that the greater gifts of soul, of imagination, of inspiration were denied to the poets of the eighteenth century, or were present in a far less degree than in their predecessors or successors. This may be due in part to Mr. Courthope's own taste and temperament, but in part also it seems to arise from the general plan of his history. His object is to trace the main currents of literature, to connect them with their social and political surroundings, to explain the rise and fall of great movements of thought, not to estimate the height and power of the inspiration of individual poets. It is a history of poetry, not of poets; and we are not entitled to demand qualities which lie outside the scheme of the work. Nevertheless Mr. Courthope is somewhat to blame for the misconception, since he gives short biographical sketches of all the principal, and many of the minor, poets of this and other periods; and in these it is difficult not to look for something more of personal appreciation, of recognition of the quality and scale of personal inspiration, than we find in this volume or its predecessors.

The general characteristics of Mr. Courthope's history are

sufficiently known from his previous volumes, which have been reviewed at length in these columns; and in a short notice it is unnecessary to say more of them. He is not an inspiring guide to English poetry, but he is a thoughtful historian of it. At times his generalizations appear somewhat forced and laboured; and it is not to be expected that all his estimates of individual poets will meet with the assent of every critic. Nevertheless his History is a great and honourable enterprise, carried out with unflinching patience and conscientious zeal; and we shall look with interest for the concluding volume of it, which is to deal with the Romantic Revival.

PERIODICALS.

The Journal of Theological Studies (Vol. VIII. No. 31. April 1907. Frowde). Sir H. H. Howorth: 'The Origin and Authority of the Biblical Canon according to the Continental Reformers. I. Luther and Karlstadt.' W. O. E. Oesterley: 'Codex Taurinensis (Y), VIII.' J. W. Thompson: 'On the Identity of Bernard of Cluny.' With a Genealogical Table. T. W. Crafer: 'Macarius Magnes, a neglected Apologist.' Mgr. G. Mercati: 'More Spanish Symptoms: The Date of some Prayers in the Mozarabic Missal. The Revision of the Toledan Missal in the VIIth century. A Supposed *Liber Officiorum* of Hilary of Poitiers.' With a correction of *J. T. S.* viii 283 by Mr. Edmund Bishop. Bishop of Ely: 'The Date of the Apocalypse: the Evidence of Irenaeus.' H. J. Lawlor: 'Hegesippus and the Apocalypse.' F. C. Burkitt: 'Four Notes on the Book of Enoch.' V. M'Nabb: 'St. Mark's Witness to the Virgin Birth.' E. F. Brown: 'I Peter v 9.' E. Nestle: 'In Memoriam Iohannis Millii, S. T. P.' F. C. Burkitt: 'Harnack *Sprüche u. Reden Jesu.*' J. Ll. Davies: Westcott *Ephesians.*' H. F. Stewart: 'Lucius *Die Anfänge des Heiligenkults in der christlichen Kirche.*' Dom Connolly: 'Duval *Les Homiliae Cathedrales de Sévère d'Antioche,* lii–lvii.' F. R. Tennant: 'Höffding *Philosophy of Religion*'; 'F. Sewall *Reason in Belief*'; 'Koelle *The Goal of the Universe*'; 'F. H. Woods *For Faith and Science*'; 'Sterrett *Freedom of Authority*'; 'Goguel *W. Herrmann et le Problème religieux actuel*'; 'Storr *Development and Divine Purpose.*'

The Expositor (Nos. 16–18. April–June 1907. Hodder and Stoughton). J. B. Mayor: 'Virgil and Isaiah: an Inquiry into the Sources of the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil.' A. Carr: 'The Testimony of St. John to the Virgin Birth of our Lord.' W. O. E. Oesterley: 'The Demonology of the Old Testament.' J. Rendel Harris: 'A Further Note on the Cretans.' See Oct. 1906. Sir W. M. Ramsay: 'Pisidian Antioch' (*continued*). A. Mansur: 'The Site of Capernaum.' Tell Hum. E. E. Kellett: 'Some Notes on Christian Dioscurism.' May. W. Sanday: 'St. Paul's Gospel: an Eirenicon.' A notable review of 'W. P. du Bose *The Gospel according to St. Paul.*' Sir W. M. Ramsay: 'The Oldest Written Gospel.' Reviews. 'Harnack *Sprüche u. Reden.*' J. H. Bernard: 'The Connexion between I Cor. v, vi.' J. Rendel Harris: 'A Speculation in Textual Criticism.' Luke xiv 5. Not 'a son' nor 'an ass' but 'a pig'! A. Souter: 'The Commentary of Pelagius on the Epistles of St. Paul.' L. B. Radford:

'Distinctions of External Function in the Holy Trinity.' J. Moffatt: 'Notes on Recent New Testament Study' (*continued* June). June. A. Westcott: 'The Divisions of I John: a Correspondence between Drs. Westcott and Hort.' J. Iverach: 'Pantheism.' A. E. Garvie: 'The Desolation of the Cross.' W. O. E. Oesterley: 'The Demonology of the Old Testament illustrated from the Prophetical Writings.' C. H. W. Johns: 'The Assuan Aramaic Papyri.' Sir W. M. Ramsay: 'The Divine Child in Virgil: a Sequel to Professor Mayor's Study.'

The Hibbert Journal (Vol. V. No. 3. April 1907. Williams and Norgate). R. J. Campbell: 'The Aim of the New Theology Movement.' 'Latinus': 'The Aim of the New Catholic Movement.' Sir O. Lodge: 'A Reformed Church as an Engine of Progress.' F. I. Paradise: 'The Living Church.' E. A. Sonnenschein: 'The New Stoicism.' 'Between Death and Life.' A. E. Garvie: 'Personality in God, Christ, Man.' R. J. Ryle: 'The Neurotic Theory of the Miracles of Healing.' C. T. Ovenden: 'The Forgiveness of Sin.' E. A. Rumball: 'The Sinlessness of Jesus.' F. Palmer: 'The Christ of the Fourth Gospel.' B. A. Millard: 'The Theology of "The Average Man."' G. Galloway: 'What do Religious Thinkers owe to Kant?' Discussions. Reviews. R. A. Duff: 'Gwatkin *The Knowledge of God*.' A. C. Haddon: 'W. H. R. Rivers *The Todas*.' M. Rhys: 'S. Reinach *Cultes, Mythes et Religions*.' L. R. Farnell: 'Frazer *Adonis, Attis and Osiris*.' W. H. Drummond: 'J. Rivière *Le Dogme de la Rédemption*' and 'G. B. Stevens *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*.' R. R. Rusk: 'Boyce Gibson *Eucken's Philosophy of Life*.' W. R. Boyce Gibson: 'A. L. Lilley *Adventus Regni*.' C. H. Toy: 'Addis *Hebrew Religion*.' St. G. Stock: 'Rickaby *Free Will and Four English Philosophers*.' N. H. Marshall: 'J. Clifford *The Ultimate Problems of Christianity*.'

The American Journal of Theology (Vol. XI. No. 2. April 1907. Chicago University Press). S. L. Gulick (and others): 'Should the Denominational Distinctions of Christian Lands be perpetuated on Mission Fields?' L. Arpee: 'An actual Experiment in Non-Sectarian Missionary Activity.' A. O. Lovejoy: 'The Origins of Ethical Inwardness in Jewish Thought.' E. O. Sisson: 'The Spirit and Value of Prussian Religious Instruction.' S. J. Case: 'Paul's historical Relation to the first Disciples.' C. M. Mead: 'What is meant by the Divinity of Man?' H. W. Wright: 'Can the Human Character of Jesus be called Divine?' D. Menant: 'Influence of Max Müller's Hibbert Lectures in India.' J. Horsch: 'Luther's Attitude towards the Principle of Liberty of Conscience.' J. M. P. Smith: 'Marti *Die Religion des A.T.*' and 'Baentsch *Altorientalischer u. israelitischer Monotheismus*.' C. Johnston: 'E. A. Wallis Budge *The Egyptian Heaven and Hell*.' A. Fairbanks: 'W. Otto *Priester u. Tempel im hellenistichen Aegypten*, I.' C. Clemen: 'Was Jesus an Historical Character?' J. W. Bailey: 'S. Monteil *Essai sur la Christologie de S. Paul*.' E. C. Richardson: 'Leipoldt *Didymus der Blinde von Alexandria*.' G. H. Gilbert: 'A. L. Feder *Justins des Märtyrers Lehre von Jesus Christus*.' E. A. Bechtel: 'E. K. Rand *Johannes Scottus*.' F. Johnson: 'T. M. Lindsay *The Reformation*, I'; 'H. C. Lea *History of the Inquisition of Spain*, II'; 'H. Barge *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt*'; 'N. Samter *Judentaufen im 19 Jahrhundert*.' C. H. Moehlmann: 'Grütz-

macher *Hieronymus.*' H. W. Wright: 'Some Interpretations of the Supernatural.' A. K. Parker: 'Dinnis *Christian Missions and Social Progress*, III.'

The Princeton Theological Review (Vol. V. No. 2. April 1907. Princeton University Press). J. Orr: 'Some Recent Developments in Criticism and Theology.' H. M. Wiener: 'The Laws of Deuteronomy and the Arguments from Silence.' J. P. Hoskins: 'German Influence on Religious Life and Thought in America during the Colonial Period, II.' J. Szlupas: 'Lithuania and its ancient Calvinistic Churches.' S. Zandstra: 'The Theory of Ancestor Worship among the Hebrews.' Reviews. B. B. Warfield: 'McTaggart *Some Dogmas of Religion*'; 'Conybeare and Stock *Selections from the LXX*'; 'V. Fritzsche *Das Berufsbewusstsein Jesu*'; 'H. C. Vedder *Balthasar Hübmaier, the Leader of the Anabaptists*'; 'E. Doumergue *Jean Calvin*, III.' H. C. Minton: 'W. L. Walker *Christian Theism and a Spiritual Monism.*' G. Macloskie: 'G. F. Wright *Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History.*' J. D. Davis: 'J. Orr *The Problem of the Old Testament with Reference to recent Criticism.*' J. G. Machen: 'L. M. Sweet *The Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ.*' R. Janssen: 'S. Goebel *Die Reden unseres Herrn nach Johannes im Grundtext*, I.' F. W. Loetscher: 'G. Hodgson, *Primitive Christian Education*'; 'Lindsay *The Reformation*, I.' C. R. Erdman: 'A. Maclaren *Expositions of Holy Scripture.*'

The Dublin Review (Vol. CXL. No. 281. April 1907. Burns and Oates). Bishop of Limerick: 'Irish University Education.' V. McNabb 'The Future of the Free Churches.' J. S. Phillimore: 'Asclepiades.' 'For Truth or for Life.' Dom A. Hamilton: 'Buckfast Abbey: a Mediaeval Chronicle.' Viscount St. Cyres: 'The Précieuses.' B. C. A. Windle: 'De Vries and the Theory of Mutation.' 'The Story of a Paris Convent.' (Les Carmes.) B. Collingwood: 'The Task before the Anti-Vivisectionists.' 'Anti-Clericalism in France.' 'The Victory of the German Centre Party.' Reviews. 'Maturin *Laws of the Spiritual Life.*' 'Towle *J. M. Neale.*' 'Nielsen *History of the Papacy in the Nineteenth Century.*' 'Ollé-Laprune *La Raison et le Rationalisme.*' 'Fr. Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. *S. Margaret of Cortona.*' B. C. A. W[indle]: 'Bastian *The Evolution of Life.*' 'Lock *Recent Progress in the Study of Variation, Heredity and Evolution.*'

The Jewish Quarterly Review (Vol. XIX. No. 75. April 1907. Macmillan). W. Bacher: 'The Origin of the Jewish Colony of Syene (Assuan).' B. Ibry: 'H. N. Byàlik and his Poems.' R. Gottheil: 'An Eleventh Century Document concerning a Cairo Synagogue.' With Maps. I. H. Hersch: 'The French Revolution and the Emancipation of the Jews.' R. H. Charles and A. Cowley: 'An Early Source of the Testaments of the Patriarchs.' With Fascimile from MS. Bodl. Hebr. C. 27. Reviews. G. Margoliouth: 'Neubauer-Cowley *Catalogue of Hebrew MSS. in the Bodleian Library*, II.' A. Wolf: 'Karpeles *Jews and Judaism in the XIXth Century.*' H. J. Loewe: 'Montague *Tales from the Talmud*' and 'Rapaport *Tales and Maxims from the Midrash.*' W. Bacher: G. Aicher *Das A.T. in der Mischna.*' V. Aptowitzer: 'D. H. Müller *Das syrisch-römische Rechtsbuch und Hamurabi.*'

The London Quarterly Review (No. 214. April 1907. C. H. Kelly).

G. G. Findlay: 'Faith: a Bible Study.' A. Burnet: 'South Africa's Greatest Problem.' The Native Question. A. J. Costain: 'The Present Position of Materialism.' D. A. de Mouilpied: 'Lamennais: a Tormented Soul.' W. A Cornaby: 'Protestant Missions in China.' H. T. Hooper: 'Presuppositions.' S. M'Comb: 'The Modern Attitude towards Belief in a Future Life.' W. B. FitzGerald: 'A Literary Resurrection.' Thomas Traherne. 'Sir Oliver Lodge's Catechism.' Reviews. 'E. F. Scott *The Fourth Gospel*.' Unfavourable. 'J. Agar Beet *Manual of Theology*.' 'W. R. Inge *Personal Idealism and Mysticism*.' 'H. J. C. Knight *The Temptation of our Lord*.' 'Dale *History of English Congregationalism*.'

The Expository Times (Vol. XVIII. Nos. 7–9. April–June 1907. T. and T. Clark). G. G. Findlay: 'The Inner Life of Jeremiah' (*continued* May–June). A. A. Brockington: 'Some Characteristics of Old Testament Miracles.' A. Deissmann: 'The New Testament in the Light of recently discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World' (*continued*). S. R. Driver: 'Notes on the Book of Judges.' W. Ewing: 'The Mount of Transfiguration.' Jebel Jermuk. A. Souter: 'The Relationship between Titus and Luke.' Brothers. Reviews. J. Moffatt: 'Steinmann *Die Abfassungszeit des Galaterbriefes*.' J. Lindsay: 'Dorner *Die Entstehung der christlichen Glaubenslehren*.' H. R. Mackintosh: 'Monteil *La Christologie de S. Paul*, I.' 'A. G. Leonard *The Religion of Nigeria*.' 'J. B. Mayor *The Epistle of Jude and II Peter*.' 'A. T. Clay *Archaeology of the Old Testament*.' May. F. Blass: 'The Origin and Character of our Gospels' (*continued* June). W. O. E. Oesterley: 'The Dove with the Olive-leaf (Gen. viii 8–11).' W. H. Griffith Thomas and J. Gilroy: 'Hosea xi 7.' W. B. Stevenson: 'Was the Ark Jehovah's Throne?' 'J. A. Bain: 'II Cor. iv 3–4.' 'In the *things* that are perishing.' E. P. Boys-Smith: 'Titus and Luke.' E. Nestle: (1) 'Pashhur = Magor-missabib'; (2) 'Sufficit diei malitia sua'; (3) 'Why are Two Books of Samuel, Kings, Chronicles in our Bibles?'; (4) 'The true Number of Verses in the New Testament.' 7957. Reviews. 'W. C. Allen *St. Matthew*.' 'G. Salmon *The Human Element in the Gospels*.' T. Kappstein: 'Harnack *Sprüche u. Reden Jesu*.' J. S. Banks: 'Bousset *Die Religion des Judentums*.' A. Souter: 'A. Seeberg *Die beiden Wege u. das Aposteldekret*.' 'Lindsay *The Reformation*, II.' 'Schiller *Studies in Humanism*.' 'L. T. Hobhouse *Morals in Evolution*.' June. J. Rendel Harris: 'Marcion and the Canon.' J. A. Selbie: 'W. C. Allen *St. Matthew*.' C. Field: 'Mohammedan Conversions.' A. H. Sayce: 'The Purchase of the Cave of Machpelah.' Dom H. Höpfl: 'II Cor. iv 3–4.' C. H. W. Johns: 'The Babylonian God Ninib.' E. König: 'Has the name "Jahweh" been discovered on the Babylonian Monuments?' V. McNabb: 'St. Thomas Aquinas on the Proofs of the Resurrection.' Reviews. L. A. Muirhead: 'L. Vaganay *Le Problème eschatologique dans le IV^e livre d'Esdras*.' J. Iverach: 'J. B. Baillie *The Idealistic Construction of Experience*.'

The Interpreter (Vol. III. No. 3. April 1907. Simpkin, Marshall). C. F. Burney: 'The Rise of a Belief in a Future Life in Israel.' F. J. Foakes-Jackson: 'Israel and Persia,' III. T. Hodgkin: 'Antiochus Epiphanes and the Maccabees.' F. R. Tennant: 'Points of Contact between Theology and Science of the Present Day,' III. S. L. Brown: 'Amos: the Man and his Message.' C. W. Emmet: 'The Problem of

the Apocalypse and its Bearing on the Conception of Inspiration.' J. B. Turner: 'Who was "The Rich Young Ruler"? a Suggestion.' St. Mark, as also 'the goodman of the house.' Reviews. 'W. M. Ramsay *Pauline and other Studies*.' 'Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, I.'

The Review and Expositor (Vol. IV. No. 2. April 1907. Louisville, Ky.). L. Burrows: 'J. P. Boyce.' N. K. Davis: 'The Possibility of Miracles.' B. H. de Ment: 'The Contribution of Sunday School Pedagogy to Spiritual Equipment.' J. S. Dill: 'Puritan Rule in Colonial Virginia.' L. W. Doolan: 'Practicality in Theological Training in the United States.' Mrs. J. G. Roach: 'I John: a Study of the New Life.' W. T. Whitley: 'The Story of Missions in Five Continents.' Reviews. E. C. Dargan: 'W. R. Nicoll *The Lamp of Sacrifice*'; 'J. Iverach *The Other Side of Greatness*'; 'Garvie *Guide to Preachers*.' W. J. McGlothlin: 'J. P. Whitney *The Reformation*'; 'Overton and Relton *The English Church, 1714–1800*.' E. Y. Mullins: 'N. H. Marshall *Theology and Truth*'; 'Schmid *The Scientific Creed of a Theologian*'; 'D. S. Cairns *Christianity in the Modern World*'; 'J. Moses *Pathological Aspects of Religious Experience*'; 'J. Nink *Jesus als Charakter*.' W. O. Carver: 'Sterrett *Freedom of Authority*.' B. H. de Ment: 'Beeching and Nairne *The Bible Doctrine of the Atonement*.' A. T. Robertson: 'Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*'; 'Sweet *The Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ*.'

The Albany Review [formerly *The Independent Review*] (Vol. I. Nos. 1–3. April–June 1907. John Lane). E. Carpenter: 'The Land Question in a Country Parish.' G. W. E. Russell: 'Ritualism and Disestablishment.' G. F. McCleary: 'The Work of the Health Visitor.' S. A. Savinkov: 'A Russian Mother: a Personal Narrative, 1897–1905' (*continued* May). May. P. Sabatier: 'The Bishops' Declaration of January 1907: a significant Episode in the Struggle between France and the Holy See.' E. Givskov: 'Small Holdings and Land Taxation.' Danish experience. D. MacCarthy: 'A. Symons *Studies in Seven Arts*.' C. F. Keary: 'Positivism.' June. F. Y. Eccles: 'Ferdinand Brunetière, 1849–1906.' D. C. Pedder: 'A Perishing Country-side.' T. H. S. Escott: 'The Story of *The Times*.' D. MacCarthy: 'De Bertouch *Life of Fr. Ignatius*.' A. W. Verrall: 'The Birth of Virgil.' O. Festy: 'The Labour Movement in France.' W. Dewar: 'The Protective Coloration of Birds: a Fallacy.' H. W. Horwill: 'The Mormon Investigation.' E. J. Urwick: 'Cross Currents in Philanthropy.'

The Quarterly Review (No. 411. April 1907. John Murray). 'Labour and Socialism in Australia.' B. Taylor: 'The Income Tax.' 'Newman and Manning.' Sir F. Pollock: 'F. W. Maitland.' 'The First Earl of Lytton.' P. Hume-Brown: 'The Character of Goethe.' J. C. Bailey: 'John Evelyn.' 'The Irish University Question.' J. C. Ewart: 'The Derivation of the Modern Horse.' Illustrated.

The Edinburgh Review (No. 420. April 1907. Longmans). 'Lord Acton's Lectures on Modern History.' 'Peasant Studies in French Fiction.' 'The Land Question.' 'The Pléiade and the Elizabethans.' 'John Evelyn.' 'Lamartine and Elvire.' 'The Menace of the Desert.' 'Sancta Sanctorum.' Illustrated. 'Garibaldi's Defence of the Roman Republic.'

The Contemporary Review (Nos. 496–8. April–June 1907. Horace Marshall). H. Paul: 'Is Literature Dying?' A. S. Peake: 'The Problem of the Old Testament.' G. Constant: 'Ferdinand Brunetière.' S. H. Mellone: 'The Present Crisis in Christian Morals.' J. Quail: 'The Investments of the Masses.' A. E. Keeton: 'The Jew in Music.' A. M. Fairbairn: 'Experience in Theology: a Chapter of Autobiography.' Reviews. 'Hobhouse *Morals in Evolution.*' 'Lodge *The Substance of Faith allied with Science.*' 'Workman *Persecution in the Early Church.*' 'E. F. Scott *The Fourth Gospel.*' 'Lockyer *Education and National Progress, 1870–1905.*' May. E. Crawford: 'Berthelot.' P. Sabatier: 'The Montagnini Papers.' J. A. M. Macdonald: 'Our Armaments: a Plea for Reduction.' G. F. Barbour: 'Dogma and Progress.' L. M. Phillipps: 'The Arab in Architecture.' A. T. Schofield: 'The Measurement of Nerve Force.' A. Brown: 'Jesus on His own Vocation.' H. Ellis: 'The Spanish People.' W. Wybergh: 'Imperial Organisation and the Colour Question' (*continued* June). J. E. G. de Montmorency: 'Country Schools for Town Children.' Reviews. 'Bussell *Christian Theology and Social Progress.*' 'R. W. Dale *History of English Congregationalism.*' June. G. G. Coulton: 'Priests and People before the Reformation,' I. L. G. Chiozza Money: 'The Investments of the Masses.' H. Rashdall: 'The Alleged Immanence of God.' Reviews. 'G. M. Trevelyan *Garibaldi's Defence of the Roman Republic.*' 'C. Booth *Old Age Pensions and the Aged Poor: a Proposal.*' 'Gamon *The London Police Court To-day and To-morrow.*' 'Lock *Recent Progress in the Study of Variation, Heredity, and Evolution.*'

The Monthly Review (Nos. 79–81. April–June 1907. Murray). M. Gorki: 'New York, the City of the Yellow Devil.' G. A. B. Dewar: 'The Ruskin Copyright.' G. S. Street: 'Ghosts of Piccadilly—the Great Duke' (*continued* May, 'Harriot Mellon'; June, 'The Palmerstons and Cambridge House'). J. Ross: 'Galileo in the Val d'Arno.' Mgr. Count Vay de Vaya: 'Alien Immigration to the United States of America.' May. 'The Irish University Question.' A. Symons: 'A Forgotten Poet—John Clare.' A. E. Keeton: 'Wanted—Music Critics.' M. F.-C.: 'Should Women Emigrate?' T. D. Hall: 'A Budget of Roman Letters—Seneca to Lucilius.' A. L. Ellis: 'Mr. Sutro's "Morality" Plays.' A. R. Orage: 'Discipline in Elementary Schools.' A. P. Nicholson: 'Vanishing London.' 'W. Raleigh *Shakespeare.*' June. A. Symons: 'Great Acting in English.' Miss Julia Marlowe and Mr. E. Sothern. E. Sternheim: 'Spinoza—an Essay.' L. S. Garrett: 'The Essence of Hardyism.' An attack on Mr. Hardy's works. F. Clay: 'Art as a Factor in the Struggle for Existence.' E. A. Pratt: 'The Conversion of Westminster.' Slum work.

The Catholic World (Vol. LXXXV. Nos. 505–7. April–June 1907. New York). G. M. Searle: 'The Recent Results of Psychical Research' (*continued* May–June). W. J. Kerby: 'Human Nature and Social Questions' (*continued* May–June). F. Klein: 'Ferdinand Brunetière.' F. A. Gasquet: 'Some Victims of the great French Revolution' (*continued* May–June). Reviews. 'Mgr. Bonomelli (Bishop of Cremona *On Religious Worship and some Defects in Popular Devotions.*' 'Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels,*' I. May. J. A. Ryan: 'Is the

Modern Spirit Anti-religious?' V. M. Crawford: 'The France of René Bazin.' E. L. Taunton: 'The Old Roman Chant.' June. T. J. Gerraro: 'The Ænigmatic Vision' (I Cor. xiii 12). M. Turmann: 'Recent Developments in France.' Reviews. 'A. Galton *Church and State in France.*' 'Lapponi *Hypnotism and Spiritism.*' 'Briggs *Psalms.*'

The Churchman (Vol. XXI. Nos. 17–18. May–June 1907. Elliot Stock). R. B. Girdlestone: 'Gnosticism: Ancient and Modern.' Reviews Sir O. Lodge and Rev. R. J. Campbell. G. S. Streatfeild: 'The Witness of Pentecost to the Claims of Christ' (*continued* June). G. E. White: 'Saint-Worship to-day in Asia-Minor.' H. M. Wiener: 'Notes on Hebrew Religion, III.' W. H. Griffith Thomas: 'The New Theology and Protestant Orthodoxy.' W. E. Chadwick: '*The Manufacture of Paupers.*' June. J. H. Knowles: 'India's Special Claims.' D. G. Whitley: 'The Image of God in Man.' C. F. Rogers: 'The Scientific Study of Pastoral Theology.' 'J. P. Maud *Preparation for Confirmation.*'

The English Historical Review (Vol. XXII. No. 86. April 1907. Longmans). J. B. Bury: 'The Ceremonial Book of Constantine Porphyrogennetos.' G. O. Orpen: 'Motes and Norman Castles in Ireland.' G. B. Hertz: 'England and the Ostend Company.' P. Vinogradoff: 'F. W. Maitland.' H. S. Cronin: 'The Twelve Conclusions of the Lollards.' In English from a MS. at Trinity Hall, Cambridge. C. H. Firth: 'Two Letters addressed to Cromwell.' Reviews. P. V. M. Benecke: 'Workman *Persecution in the Early Church.*' Important. J. B. Bury: 'J. Peisker *Die älteren Beziehungen der Slawen zu Turkotataren und Germanen.*' 'Destroys the results of Lippert's *Social geschichte Böhmens.*' E. Gwynn: 'Windisch *Die altirische Heldensage Táin Bo Cúalnge.*' Lengthy. E. Barker: 'Bréhier *L'Église et l'Orient au Moyen Age: les Croisades.*' H. W. C. Davis: 'Hanquet *La Chronique de S. Hubert dite Cantatorium.*' W. H. St. J. Hope: 'Lethaby *Westminster Abbey and the King's Craftsmen*'; 'O. Redlich *Rudolf von Habsburg.*' R. S. Rait: 'C. L. Kingsford *Chronicles of London.*' J. Gairdner: 'H. A. L. Fisher *Political History of England,* 1485–1547.' K. D. Vernon. 'M. Schipa *Il Regno di Napoli al Tempo di Carlo di Borbone.*' E. H. Parker: 'A. Launay *Journal d'André Ly, prêtre chinois,* 1746–63. Texte latin.' T. W. Jackson: 'Ungherini *Manuel de Bibliographie biographique et d'Iconographie des Femmes célèbres.*' 'Medlycott *India and the Apostle Thomas.*' 'Workman and Pope *Letters of John Hus.*' G. McN. R[ushforth]: 'Thureau-Dangin *La Renaissance Catholique en Angleterre au XIX^e^ siècle,* III.'

The Economic Review (Vol. XVII. No. 2. April 1907. Rivingtons). J. Carter: 'First Impressions of India.' N. B. Dearle: 'Immigration and Transmigration.' E. Raikes: 'L'Abbé Rambaud.' A. Mercer: 'Unemployment, I.' L. A. M. P. McCracken: 'Infant Mortality.' Reviews. L. L. Price: 'J. B. Crozier *The Wheel of Wealth.*' B. L. Hutchins: 'H. Bosanquet *The Family.*' J. Carter: 'Rowntree and Sherwell *The Taxation of the Liquor Trade,* I.'

The Classical Quarterly (Vol. 1. No. 1. April 1907. Nutt). E. O. Winstedt: 'Mavortius and Prudentius.' A. N. Jannaris: 'The Digamma, Koppa, and Sampi as Numerals in Greek.'

The Classical Review (Vol. XXI. Nos. 3–4. May–June 1907. Nutt).

J. E. Sandys : ' Friedrich Blass.' T. W. Allen : ' Bassi *Catalogus codicum graecorum Bibliothecae Ambrosianae.*' T. Hodgkin : ' Negri *Julian the Apostate*' [E. T.]. June. W. Rhys Roberts : ' P. S. Allen *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi.*' F. Haverfield : ' Macdonald and Park *The Roman Forts on the Bar Hill, Dumbartonshire.*' H. L. Bell : ' Greek Papyri.' Reviews ' Mayser *Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri*' and other works.

Revue Biblique Internationale (Vol. IV. No. 2. April 1907. Paris : Lecoffre). M. J. Lagrange : ' La Crète ancienne. I. Les palais crétois.' Illustrated. M. van Hoonacker : ' Notes d'exégèse sur quelques passages difficiles d'Osée ' (*suite*). Hos. x. 9–10, xi. 4, 6–7, xii. 4–7, xiii. 1–2. H. Coppieters : ' Le décret des Apôtres (Act. xv. 28–9),' II. P. Dhorme : ' I Sam. xiii., Critique textuelle et littéraire.' L. Delaporte : ' L'évangéliaire héracléen de Horus.' M. J. Lagrange : ' Les papyrus araméens d'Eléphantine.' P. Dhorme : ' L'arbre de vérité et l'arbre de vie.' M. Abel : ' Document épigraphique sur le patriarche Eustochios.' H. Vincent : ' A propos d'une inscription relative à S. Etienne ' ; ' Musil *Karte von Arabia Petraea.*' M. Abel : ' Von Soden *Die Schriften des N.T.*' H. Coppieters : ' E. Gigot *Special Introduction to the Study of the O.T.*' M. J. Lagrange : ' Heigl *Verfasser u. Adresse des Briefes an die Hebräer* ' ; ' Hummelauer *Commentarius in Paralipomenon I.*' ' Faïtlovitch *Mota Muse* (La Mort de Moïse) texte éthiopien avec traduction hebraïque et française.'

Revue Bénédictine (Vol. XXIV. No. 2. April 1907. Maredsous). A. Wilmart : ' L'*Ad Constantinum Liber primus* de S. Hilaire de Poitiers et les *Fragments historiques.*' G. Morin : ' Le *Te Deum*, type anonyme d'Anaphore latine préhistorique ? ' Discusses Dom Cagin's *Te Deum ou Illatio.*' R. Ancel : ' La disgrâce et le procès des Carafa.' D. de Bruyne : (1) ' Un MS. complet du IV Esdras.' At Brussels, Nos. 9107–9110. (2) ' Le prologue inédit de Pélage à la première lettre aux Corinthiens.' Mgr. Mercati : ' Il codice Corviniano delle Epistole di S. Ignazio.' G. Morin : (1) ' Pour un prochain volume d'Anecdota.' (2) ' H. Brewer *Kommodian von Gaza.*' U. Berlière : ' Le cardinal Nicolas de Cuse dans le diocèse de Liège (1451–2).' Comptes rendus. ' Aicher *Das A.T. in der Mischna.*' ' Mangenot *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique.*' H. Leclercq : ' A. Michel *Histoire de l'Art. II. Formation, expansion et évolution de l'Art Gothique.*' Favourable.

Revue de l'Orient Chrétien (N.S. Vol. II. No. I. 1907. Paris). L. Guerrier : ' Un " Testament (éthiopien) de Notre Seigneur et Sauveur Jésus Christ " en Galilée.' MSS. Paris. Bibl. Nat. Eth. 51 and Brit. Mus. Or. 793. Mgr. A. Scher : ' Analyse de l'histoire de Rabban bar 'Edta ' (*fin*). F. Nau : (1) ' Analyse de deux opuscules astrologiques attribués au prophète Esdras et d'un calendrier lunaire de l'A.T. attribué à Esdras, aux Egyptiens et même à Aristote.' MSS. Paris. Bibl. Nat. graec. 2149, 22, 2494 and Suppl. 636 : 2286 : 2149, Suppl. 1191, 1148 ; (2) ' Histoire des solitaires Egyptiens : MS. Coisl. 126 ' ; (3) ' Une ancienne traduction latine du Bélinous arabe (Apollonius de Tyane) faite par Hugo Sanctelliensis et conservée dans un MS. du XII^e^ siècle.' MS. Paris. Bibl. Nat. lat. 13951. F. Tournebize : ' Étude sur la conversion de l'Arménie au Christianisme ainsi que sur la doctrine et les usages de l'église arménienne

primitive.' S. Vaillié: 'Les Eglises saint-Etienne à Jérusalem.' L. Leroy: 'Notes sur deux ouvrages de Sévère Ibn al-Moqaffa (histoire des conciles).' F. Nau: 'Mangenot *L'authenticité mosaïque du Pentateuque.*'

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique (Vol. VIII. No. 2. April 1907. Louvain). Dom C. Baur: 'L'entrée littéraire de S. Chrysostome dans le monde latin.' P. Doncœur: 'Les premières interventions du Saint-Siège relatives à l'Immaculée Conception' (xii^e–xiv^e). A. Fierens: 'La question franciscaine. Le MS. II. 2326 de la Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, II.' L. Willaert: 'Négociations politico-religieuses entre l'Angleterre et les Pays-Bas catholiques (1598–1625). II. Intervention des souverains anglais en faveur du protestantisme.' Comptes rendus. E. Tobac: 'Juncker *Die Ethik der Apostels Paulus*, I.' G. Rasneur: 'A. d'Alès *La théologie de S. Hippolyte.*' C. Bauer: 'F. Cavallera *Le Schisme d'Antioche* (IV^e–V^e siècle) et *S. Eustathii episcopi Antiocheni in Lazarum, Mariam et Martham Homilia.*' G. Voisin: 'Weigl *Die Heilslehre des hl. Cyrill von Alexandrien.*' E. van der Mynsbrugge: 'Kehr *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum.*' A. Monin: 'A. Knecht *System des justinianischen Kirchenvermögenrechtes.*' Dom C. Mohlberg: 'J. Kösters *Studien zu Mabillons römischen Ordines.*' M. Jaquin: 'Hellmann *Sedulius Scottus*' et 'Rand *Johannes Scottus*'; 'Halm *Thomas Bradwardinus u. seine Lehre von der menschlichen Willensfreiheit.*' A. Fierens: '*Analecta Franciscana*, IV.' Lengthy. G. Mollat: 'Soranzo *La guerra fra Venezia e la S. Sede per il dominio di Ferrara.*' A. de Ridder: 'Thureau-Dangin *La Renaissance catholique en Angleterre au XIX^e siècle, III.*'; 'T' Serclaes *Vie de Léon XIII*, III.' G. Doutrepont: 'J. Favre *Lacordaire orateur, sa formation et la chronologie de ses œuvres.*'

Revue des Questions Historiques (No. 162. April 1907. Paris). A. d'Alès: 'La question baptismale au temps de S. Cyprien.' G. Guillot: 'Léopold I^er et sa Cour (1681–4).' Baron de Maricourt et A. Driart: 'Une abbaye de filles au XVIII^e siècle: Gomerfontaine.' H. du Bourg: 'Religieux et Monastère persécutés au XVIII^e siècle.' P. Bliard: 'La guerre aux émigrés: un épisode de la jeunesse du P. Loriquet.' J. Viard: 'La fiscalité pontificale en France au XIV^e siècle.' L. Maitre: 'Une coalition religieuse en 1792 chez les Bretons.' Dom F. Cabrol: 'Swete *The Apocalypse*'; 'Burkitt *The Gospel History and its Transmission*'; 'Durell *The Christian Church*'; 'Abbott *Silanus the Christian*'; 'Bigg *Wayside Sketches in Ecclesiastical History*'; 'Hodgkin *Political History of England to the Norman Conquest*'; 'Innes *England under the Tudors*'; 'Gasquet *Parish Life in Mediæval England.*'

Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses (Vol. XII. No. 2. March–April 1907. Paris: Picard). L. de la V. Poussin: 'Çāntideva *Introduction à la Pratique des futurs Bouddhas*, VI.' G. Herzog: 'La conception virginale du Christ.' F. Cumont: 'Notes de mythologie manichéenne: I. La séduction des archontes; II. L'omophore.' A. Loisy: 'Harnack *Lukas der Arzt*'; 'Sanday *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*' (unfavourable); 'Mayer-Luther *Die Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme*'; 'Dujardin *La source du fleuve chrétien: I. Le judaisme*'; 'Schweitzer *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*'; 'Baentsch *Altorientalischer u. israelitischer Monotheismus*'; 'Dibelius *Die Lade Jahves*'; 'Batiffol *L'Enseignement de Jésus*'; 'Thieme

Die christliche Demut, I.' J. Burel: 'Buonaiuti *Lo Gnosticismo, Storia di antiche lotte religiose*'; 'Grisar-Ledos *Histoire de Rome et des Papes au moyen âge*. May–June. H. Hemmer: 'La Doctrine des Douze Apôtres (Didache).' 'Mgr. Darboy et le Saint-Siège, documents inédits.' A. Dièς: 'Gomperz *Die Lebensauffassung der griechischen Philosophen u. das Ideal der Inneren Freiheit.*'

Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique (Nos. 4–6. April–June 1907. Paris: Lecoffre). G. Michelet: 'Contingentisme et Apologétique néo-positiviste.' 'P. Dhorme *Choix de textes religieux assyro-babyloniens, transcription, traduction, commentaire.*' May. L. Maisonneuve: 'Un cardinal philosophe, Mgr. Mercier.' L. Desnoyers: 'Papyrus juifs araméens du V^e^ siècle avant J.-C.' (*continued* June). 'Piat *De la Croyance en Dieu.*' Lengthy. Mgr. Batiffol: 'Le Gnosticisme d'après M. Bonaiuti (*sic*).' Notes et Critiques: 'Le Cardinal Newman.'

Studi Religiosi (Vol. VII. Nos. 2–3. March-April, May–June, 1907. Florence). A. Palmieri: 'Le condizioni politico-religiose della Polonia russa.' D. Battaini: 'Il rinascimento cattolico in Inghilterra,' II. (*continued* May). S. M[inocchi]: 'Razionalismo e Razionalisti—una questione di Vocabolario.' S. Minocchi: '*Le Profezie d'Isaia*, con una Lettera del Cardinale Svampa.' 'Versione d'Isaia lx. 22–lxvi. 24.' Reviews. 'Harnack *Lukas der Arzt.*' 'J. B. Carter *The Religion of Numa.*' H. Marucchi *Eléments d'Archéologie chrétienne.*' 'J. A. Bain *The New Reformation.*' 'Bonomelli *On Religious Worship and some Defects in Popular Devotions.*' May–June. L. Visconti: 'La conversione religiosa—saggio di psicologia.' 'Gli Atti dei Martiri autentici e spuri.' 'Houtin *La crise du clergé.*' 'Le Morin *Vérités d'hier? La théologie traditionnelle et les critiques catholiques.*' 'E. le Roy *Dogme et Critique.*' I. G[uidi]: 'F. Martin *Le livre d'Hénoch.*' 'Vacandard *L'Inquisition. Étude historique et critique sur le pouvoir coercitif de l'Eglise.*' 'F. Klein *La découverte du Vieux Monde par un Etudiant de Chicago.*' 'La Pontificia Commissione biblica e il Quarto Vangelo.' S. Minocchi: (1) 'La Cosmogonia Biblica'; (2) 'Genesi ii. 4–13.'

Teologisk Tidsskrift (Vol. VIII. Nos. 2–3. 1907. Copenhagen). *V.* Ammundsen: 'Studier over vore Reformatorers Nadverlære.' Reviews. F. Torm: 'Kähler *Zur Bibelfrage.*' Lengthy. N. M. Plum: 'Reinhardt *Prinzipienlehre der luth. Dogmatik*, 1700–50.' A. Mollerup: 'H. J. Brunhes *Ruskin et la Bible : pour servir à l'Histoire d'une Pensée.*' No. 3. E. Geismar: 'Hegel.' M. J. Gjessing: 'Kirkeligt Liv i Norge 1905–6.' J. P. Bang: 'W. James *Religiose Erfaringer.*' L. Glahn: 'J. O. Andersen *Kirkeorganisation udenlands.*'

The Church Missionary Review (Vol. LVIII. Nos. 696–8. April–June 1907. C.M.S.). 'The Science of Religion.' Reviews recent works by Mr. L. T. Hobhouse, Major Leonard, Dr. F. B. Jevons, and Prof. Gwatkin. 'John Shaw Burdon.' May. 'The Abolition of 1807—a Question and a Reminder.' A. G. Frazer: 'Education as a Means of Evangelization.' T. Walker: 'Present Religious Awakenings in the Church in India.' June. Archbishop of Canterbury: 'The Kingdom of God is come upon You.' Sermon at 108th Anniversary of C.M.S. H. W. Weatherhead: 'Education in Central Africa.' A. F. Painter: 'The Call of the Indian Outcastes.'

The East and the West (Vol. V. No. 18. April 1907. S.P.G.). Sir E. Satow: 'Christian Missions in China and Japan.' Bishop A. G. S. Gibson: 'Polygamy and Christianity in S. Africa.' J. H. Maclean: 'Is Hinduism conducive to Unworldliness.' C. F. Andrews: 'The Junior Clergy Missionary Associations.' A. Lankester: 'The Pioneer Work of Medical Missions.' Archbishop of Brisbane: 'A New Mission to the Australian Aboriginals.' J. Kennedy: 'St. Thomas and his Tomb at Mylapore.' E. Stock: 'The Red Indian Missions in N.W. Canada: their first half-century.' D. Ellison: 'Some Aspects of Education in S. Africa: a Reply.' Reviews. 'A. M. Stoddart *Life of Isabella Bird (Mrs. Bishop)*.' 'G. K. Scott Moncrieff *Eastern Missions from a Soldier's Standpoint*.'

Books Received.

The more important will be reviewed in short notices or articles as space permits.

Biblical and Kindred Studies.

Cheyne, T. K.—*Traditions and Beliefs of Ancient Israel.* Pp. xx+592. (A. and C. Black.) 15*s.* net.

Fleming, J. D.—*Israel's Golden Age: the Story of the United Kingdom.* 'Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students.' Pp. 160. (T. and T. Clark.) 1*s.* 6*d.*

Grimme, H.—*The Law of Hammurabi and Moses. A Sketch.* Translated from the German together with a translation from the Babylonian of the Laws discussed, and chapters on *The History and Archæology of the Hammurabiand Mosaic Codes.* By W. T. Pilter. Pp. 150. (S.P.C.K.) 2*s.*

Harnack, A.—*Luke the Physician: the Author of the Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles.* Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. 'Crown Theological Library.' Pp. xii+232. (Williams and Norgate.) 6*s.*

'Kalamos.'—*Prophetical Suggestions, being Expository of the Books of Revelation and Daniel.*' Pp. xvi+760. (London: Digby, Long & Co.)

Kelly, W. (the late).—*An Exposition of the Gospel of Mark.* Edited, with Additions, by E. E. Whitfield. Pp. vi+282. (Elliot Stock.) 5*s.* net.

Pusey, E. B. (the late).—*The Minor Prophets with a Commentary explanatory and practical, and Introductions to the several Books.* Vol. VI. Habakkuk and Malachi. Pp. 290. (Nisbet.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net. The last volume of an interesting reprint.

Ragg, L. and L.—*The Gospel of Barnabas.* Edited and translated from the Italian MS. in the Imperial Library at Vienna. With a Facsimile. Pp. lxxx+500. (Clarendon Press.) 16*s.* net.

Redpath, H. A.—*The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel.* With Introduction and Notes. 'Westminster Commentaries.' Pp. xlii+276. (Methuen.) 10*s.* 6*d.*

Sharpe, S.—*Historic Notes on the Books of the Old and New Testaments.* Pp. xii+312. (Stock.) 6*s.* net. Fourth edition.

Streane, A. W.—*The Book of Esther.* With Introduction and Notes. 'Cambridge Bible.' Pp. xxxvi+80. (Cambridge University Press.) 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

Swete, H. B.—*The Apocalypse of St. John.* The Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. Second edition. Pp. ccxx + 338. (Macmillan.) 15*s*. See Review of 1st edit. April 1907. The second embodies some corrections.

Whitham, A. R.—*Readings in Old Testament History.* Pp. xii + 362. (Rivingtons.) 2*s*. 6*d*.

Wiener, H. M.—*Notes on Hebrew Religion.* Pp. 32. (Stock.) 6*d*. Reprinted from *The Churchman*.

Williams, A. L.—*The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon.* 'Cambridge Greek Testament.' Pp. lxxiv + 208. (Cambridge University Press.) 3*s*.

Metaphysics and Moral Philosophy.

Child, T.—*Root-Principles in Rational and Spiritual Things.* Second Edition. Pp. 142. (Allenson.) 6*d*.

Davidson, W. L.—*The Stoic Creed.* Pp. xxiv + 274. (T. and T. Clark.) 4*s*. 6*d*. net.

De Steiger, I.—*On a Gold Basis : a Treatise on Mysticism.* Pp. xvi + 350. (London : P. Wellby.) 3*s*. 6*d*. net.

Frommel, G.—*Études morales et religieuses.* Pp. 374. (Saint-Blaise : Foyer Solidariste.) 3 fr. 50.

James, W.—*Pragmatism : a New Name for some Old Ways of Thinking.* Popular Lectures on Philosophy. Pp. xiv + 310. (Longmans.) 4*s*. 6*d*. net.

Straus, R.—*The Dust which is God : an Undimensional Adventure.* Pp. 62. (Norwich : Samurai Press.) 2*s*. net.

Apologetics.

Anderson, Sir R.—*In Defence : a Plea for the Faith.* Pp. xvi + 198. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 5*s*.

Brockington, A. A.—*Old Testament Miracles in the Light of the Gospel.* With an Introductory Note by the Bishop of Gloucester. Pp. xvi + 144. (T. and T. Clark.) 3*s*. net.

Browne, A. B.—*The New Testament Books : a Fair Field and No Favour.* Pp. 32. (S.P.C.K.) 3*d*.

Redpath, H. A.—*Christ, the Fulfilment of Prophecy.* Pp. 48. (S.P.C.K.) 6*d*.

Ecclesiastical History.

Abbott, G. F.—*Israel in Europe.* Pp. xx + 534. (Macmillan.) 10*s*. net.

Clark, J. W.—*Liber Memorandorum Ecclesie de Bernewelle.* With Introduction by (the late) F. W. Maitland. Pp. lxiv + 392. (Cambridge University Press.) 15*s*. net.

Figgis, J. N.—*Studies of Political Thought from Gerson to Grotius.* Pp. viii + 258. (Cambridge University Press.) 3*s*. 6*d*. net.

Lewis, A. S., and Gibson, M. D.—*Forty-one Facsimiles of dated Christian Arabic MSS.* With Text and English Translation. 'Studia Sinaitica, XII.' With Introductory Observations on Arabic Calligraphy by D. S. Margoliouth. Pp. xxii + 82. (Cambridge University Press.) 10*s*. 6*d*. net.

Metcalfe, W.—*Origen the Teacher.* Being the Address of Gregory

the Wonder-Worker to Origen, together with Origen's Letter to Gregory. Translated with Introduction and Notes. Pp. 96. (S.P.C.K.) 1*s.* 6*d.*

SAINTYVES, P.—*Les Saints successeurs des Dieux.* 'Essais de Mythologie chrétienne.' Pp. 416. (Paris: Nourry.) 6 fr.

STEPHENS, VERY REV. W. R. W. (the late) and CAPES, W. W.—*The Bishops of Winchester.* I. Birinus to Stigand. II. Walkelin to Gardiner. Illustrated. Pp. vi+88. (Winchester: Warren & Son. London: Simpkin.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net. Reprinted from the *Winchester Diocesan Chronicle.*

STOKES, G. T. (the late).—*Ireland and the Celtic Church.* A History of Ireland from St. Patrick to the English Conquest in 1172. Sixth edition, revised by H. J. LAWLOR. Pp. xvi+382. (S.P.C.K.) 5*s.*

TURNER, C. H.—*Ecclesiæ Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima. Canonum et Conciliorum græcorum Interpretationes latinæ.* II. 1. *Concilia Ancyritanum et Neocæsariense.* Pp. xii+144. (Clarendon Press.) 18*s.*

WILBOIS, J.—*L'Avenir de l'Église russe: essai sur la crise sociale et religieuse en Russie.* Pp. viii+304. (Paris: Bloud.) 4 fr.

DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY.

BROWN, W. A.—*Christian Theology in Outline.* Pp. xvi+468. (T. and T. Clark.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

BUCKLE, H.—*The After Life: a Help to a Reasonable Belief in the Probation Life to come.* Pp. viii+296. (Stock.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

HALL, F. J.—*Introduction to Dogmatic Theology.* Pp. xlii+274. (Longmans.) 6*s.* net.

HARRISON, F.—*The Creed of a Layman. Apologia pro Fide mea.* Pp. vi+412. (Macmillan.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

HEDLEY, RIGHT REV. J. C. (Bishop of Newport).—*The Holy Eucharist.* Pp. xx+278. (Longmans.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

LAING, C. E.—*Some Teachings of the Book of Common Prayer.* Pp. viii+316. (Lincoln: W. K. Morton.)

SCOTT, M.—*Crux Crucis: the Problem of the Atonement.* Pp. 128. (Simpkin, Marshall.) 1*s.*

STEWART, H. F.—*Doctrina Romanensium de Invocatione Sanctorum.* Being a Brief Inquiry into the Principles that Underlie the Practice of the Invocation of Saints. With Introduction by the BISHOP OF SALISBURY. Pp. 112. (S.P.C.K.) 2*s.* 6*d.*

TALLACK, W.—*The Scriptural Limitations of the Friends' Doctrine of the Sacraments.* Pp. 18. (London: Headley Bros.) 2*d.*

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

ELLISON, J., and WALPOLE, G. H. S.—*Church and Empire: a Series of Essays on the Responsibilities of Empire.* With Preface by the ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. Pp. xvi+240. (Longmans.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

HEADLAM, S. D.—*The Socialist's Church.* 'Labour Ideal Series.' Pp. viii+84. (G. Allen.) 1*s.* net.

LEIGHTON, J. A.—*Jesus Christ and the Civilization of To-day.* The Ethical Teaching of Jesus considered in its Bearings on the Moral Foundations of Modern Culture. Pp. xii+248. (The Macmillan Co.) 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

MATTHEWS, S.—*The Church and the Changing Order.* Pp. x+256. (The Macmillan Co.) 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

RAUSCHENBUSCH, W.—*Christianity and the Social Crisis.* Pp. xvi+428. (The Macmillan Co.) 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

ROSEGGER, P.—*My Kingdom of Heaven.* Pp. viii+330. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6*s.*

DEVOTIONAL THEOLOGY.

BRETT, G. (the late).—*Fellowship with God.* Edited, with a Prefatory Memoir, by J. BRETT. Pp. viii+140. (Mowbray.) 2*s.* net.

CARUS-WILSON, MRS. A.—*Redemptor Mundi.* A scheme for the Missionary Study of the Four Gospels. Pp. viii+102. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 1*s.*

DE BARY, R.—*Mystical Fellowship : the Science of Christliness.* A Catholic Eirenicon from the Exponents of the Mystical Gospel of Brotherliness. Pp. xx+300. (Longmans.) 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

HALL, C. M.—*The Life of a Christian.* Some Suggestions for Short Studies in the Spiritual Life. With Introduction by the BISHOP OF MILWAUKEE. Pp. xii+132. (Longmans.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

LEJEUNE, P.—*Holy Communion : Preparation and Thanksgiving.* Pp. 380. (Paris : Lethielleux. London : Burns and Oates.) 3*s.* 6*d.*

MOLINOS, MICHAEL DE.—*The Spiritual Guide which Disentangles the Soul.* Edited, with an Introduction, by (the late) K. LYTTELTON, with a Note by H. S. HOLLAND. Pp. xxii+204. (Methuen.) 2*s.* A welcome addition to the 'Library of Devotion.'

RICHARDSON, G. L.—*The Travail of His Soul.* A Three Hours' Meditation for Good Friday. Pp. viii+68. (Mowbray.)

SHARPE, G. H.—*Thoughts for the Thankful : Little Helps to a Habit of Thankfulness.* Pp. viii+140. (Wells Gardner.) 1*s.* 6*d.*

A Day-Book of Short Readings for Use by Busy People. Trinity to Advent. By the Author of *Præparatio.* With Preface by G. CONGREVE, S.S.J.E. Pp. xvi+436. (Masters.) 6*s.* net.

LITURGICA.

MITCHELL, E. H.—*Prayer-Book Saints and Holy Days.* Pp. 124. (S.P.C.K.) 1*s.*

WALKER, E. T. M.—*The Popes and Ordination.* Pp. 40. (London : W. Knott.) 1*s.* net.

WESTON, F. H.—*The Prayer Book in the Making, or the Plain Man's History of the Book of Common Prayer.* Pp. vi+216. (Murray.) 5*s.* net.

Forms for Children's Service. Sanctioned by the BISHOP OF EXETER. Pp. 26. (S.P.C.K.) 1*d.*

CHURCH MUSIC.

POTT, F.—*Free Rhythm Psalter.* Pp. 424. (Frowde.) 3*s.*

SMYTHE, F. H. D.—*The Choir Psalter.* Being the Cathedral Psalter, containing the Psalms of David together with the Canticles and Proper Psalms pointed for Chanting, with Explanatory Notes and Paragraphs. Pp. xxvi+270. (Novello.)

WALPOLE, G. H. S.—*The People's Psalter,* containing the Psalms of David, together with the Litany and the Canticles and Hymns of the Church, with *Cathedral Psalter* Pointing. Pp. xvi+300. (Stock.)

List of Approved Church Music for the Archdiocese of Westminster. Pp. viii+104. (Burns and Oates.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Sermons and Addresses.

Bethune-Baker, J. F.—*The Old Faith and the New Learning : Ready To-day to give an Account concerning the Hope which is in You.* Addresses to Ordination Candidates, Advent 1906. With Introductory Note by the Dean of Westminster. Pp. 64. (S.P.C.K.) 6*d.*

Brown, C., Walker, W. L., and others.—*God's Garden.* Sermons for Harvest and Flower Festivals. Pp. viii+278. (Manchester : J. Robinson.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Gibson, Right Rev. E. C. S. (Bishop of Gloucester).—*The Old Testament in the New.* 'Warburtonian Lectures,' 1903–7. Pp. xii+194. (Wells Gardner.) 3*s.* 6*d.*

Inge, W. R.—*Death the Fulfilment of Life.* Pp. 16. (Stock.) 6*d.* Preached before the University of Cambridge, March 3, 1907.

Jelf, G. E.—*'Sound Words' : their Form and Spirit.* Addresses on the English Prayer-Book. Pp. 256. (S.P.C.K.) 3*s.* 6*d.*

Mortimer, A. G.—*One Hundred Miniature Sermons.* Being a very full Outline Sermon on the Epistles and Gospels for all the Sundays, Holy Days, and Saints' Days of the Christian Year. Part IV. Pp. 165–334. (Skeffington.) 2*s.* net.

Richardson, G. L.—*Sermons for Harvest.* Pp. 96 (Skeffington.) 2*s.* net.

Winnington-Ingram, Right Rev. A. F. (Bishop of London).—*The Call of the Father.* Pp. viii+248. (Wells Gardner.) 1*s.*

General Literature and Biography.

Alston, L.—*The White Man's Work in Asia and Africa : a Discussion of the Main Difficulties of the Colour Question.* 'Maitland Prize Essay,' 1906. Pp. x+136. (Longmans.) 3*s.* net.

Atkinson, J. C. (the late).—*Forty Years in a Moorland Parish : Reminiscences and Researches in Danby in Cleveland.* Reprinted with Portraits, and Prefatory Memoir by G. A. Macmillan. Pp. xlviii+470 (Macmillan.) 5*s.* net. A most welcome reprint. See Article *C.Q.R.* (July 1892).

Davis, F. H.—*The Persian Mystics : Jalálu'd-dín Rúmí.* 'Wisdom of the East' Series. Pp. 106. (Murray.) 2*s.* net.

Edwards, J. H.—*God and Music.* Pp. 320. (Dent.)

Frommel, G.—*Etudes Littéraires et Morales.* Pp. viii+332. (Saint-Blaise : Foyer Solidariste.) 4 fr.

Jebb, Sir R. C. (the late).—*Essays and Addresses.* Pp. vi+648. (Cambridge University Press.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Masterman, G. F. G.—*Frederick Denison Maurice.* 'Leaders of the Church, 1800–1900.' Pp. xii+240. (Mowbray.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Morrison, J.—*New Ideas in India during the XIXth Century : a Study of Social, Political, and Religious Developments.* Pp. xiv+282. (Macmillan.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Raleigh, W.—*Shakespeare.* 'English Men of Letters.' Pp. vi+232. (Macmillan.) 2*s.* net.

Russell, G. W. E.—*Dr. Pusey.* 'Leaders of the Church, 1800–1900.' Pp. xii+214. (Mowbray.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Smythe Palmer, A.—*Some Curios from a Word-Collector's Cabinet.* Pp. vi+198. (Routledge.) 2*s.* 6*d.*

Thomson, E. I.—*Recollections and Letters of the Rev. W. H. E. McKnight.* Pp. xii+372. (Masters.) 6*s.*

T., F. G. F.—*The Steep Ascent: Memorials of Arthur Heber Thomas and Records of the Ramnad Mission, S.P.G.*, 1532–1906. With Prefatory Note by E. Gell. Pp. xiv+262. (Bemrose.) 5*s.* net.

Miscellaneous.

Caillard, E. M.—*The Garden, the Wilderness and the City.* Pp. 64. (S.P.C.K.) 6*d.*

Elffers, H.—*Impressions by the Way.* Pp. 224. (Cape Town: J. C. Juta & Co.)

Hampson, W.—*Modern Thraldom: a New Social Gospel.* Pp. xii+162. (Wells Gardner.) 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

Henry, S.—*Christus Redivivus.* Pp. 148. (London: Drane.) 5*s.* net.

Hervey, Lord Francis. *Corolla S. Eadmundi: the Garland of S. Edmund K. & M.* Pp. lxiv+672. (Murray.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net. Beautifully produced.

Inglish, G.—*The New Theology, or What is Man?* Pp. 16. (Walter Scott.) 1*d.*

Johnson, G. B.—*Freedom through the Truth.* An Examination of Rev. Dr. A. V. G. Allen's *Freedom in the Church.* Pp. vi+80. (Longmans.) 1*s.* net.

Kidd, W.—*The Sense of Touch in Mammals and Birds with Special Reference to the Papillary Ridges.* Pp. viii+176. (A. and C. Black.) 5*s.* net. With 164 Illustrations from Drawings and Micro-photographs.

Levy, S.—*Original Virtue and other Short Studies.* Pp. x+178. (Longmans.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Oswald, L.—*My Little French Friends.* Illustrated. Pp. viii+84. (Moring.) 2*s.* A charming little book of stories, songs, etc., in easy French.

Pratt, E. A.—*The Licensing Trade: an independent Survey.* Pp. x+330. (Murray.) 5*s.* net.

Sabatier, P.—*Lettre ouverte à S.E. le cardinal Gibbons à propos de son Manifeste sur la séparation des Églises et de l'État en France.* Pp. xx+84. (Paris: Librairie Fischbacher.)

Smith, A. H.—*The Uplift of China.* With a supplementary chapter upon the work of the C.M.S. Pp. xii+304. (C.M.S.) 2*s.* net.

Stracey, M. H. R., and Hoste, M. R.—*Divine Stories, or Hidden Truths.* A Book for Boys. Pp. 96. (S.P.C.K.) 1*s.* 6*d.*

Sturge, C. Y.—*Points of Church Law and other Writings illustrative of the Law of the Church.* Pp. xvi+156. (Macmillan.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Hints to Parsons. By A Parson. Pp. 38. (S.P.C.K.) 6*d.*

The Magazine of Christian Art. Vol. I. No. 1. April 1907. Pp. 38. (London: Bemrose.) 2*s.* An American magazine with good illustrations.

The Quiver, June 1907. (Cassell & Co.) 6*d.* Five Hundredth Number.

INDEX TO VOL. LXIV

ABE

ABBEYS, The Unpopularity of the, 370 *sqq.*: popular notions about monastic institutions, 370; original object of monasteries, 371; life of monks under the Benedictine Rule, 372; the abbey of St. Albans: powers and 'rights' of its abbots, 374 *sq.*; its monopolies, 376; growth of the town of St. Albans (formerly Verulam), *ib.*; the townsfolk's opposition to the abbey's claim of jurisdiction, 377; its attempt to make the town surrender old charters of rights: the mill question, 378; the abbey's quarrel with the Friars, 379; William Grindecobbe's attempt to recover the town's liberty, 380; outbreak of the Peasant Revolt: the abbot's fright, 381; the King commands him to restore their lost charters to St. Albans, 382; a mob forces the hesitating Abbot to yield, 383; fate of the charter *De Libertatibus Villanorum*, 384; trial of Grindecobbe, 387; his execution, 388; the abbeys became a social incubus, 390

Abbott, Rev. Dr., *Silanus the Christian*, 435

Alston, Mr. L., *Christian and Stoic in the Second Century*, 454

BALLINGER, Mr. J., *The Bible in Wales*, 227

Beet, Rev. Dr. J. A., *A Manual of Theology*, 229

Benedictine Abbey of Westminster, The, 58 *sqq.*: Widmore's work (1751) on the history of the Abbey, 58; Dean Stanley's *Memorials*, 59; Mr. Lethaby's recent work: tracing the craftsmen who built the Abbey, 60; their nationality, 61; imitation of the best points in the great churches of France, *ib.*; Mr. Lethaby's account of original forms of various parts of the Abbey, 63; the topography of the precincts, 65; the social life of the dwellers in the buildings: information afforded by the Customaries, 66; account of John Islip, the last Abbot, 67; his interest in the building operations of the Abbey, 70; the discussion about the 'Jesus Chapel,' the 'Jesus Mass' and 'Jesus anthem,' 71; Islip's chantry, 73; the five altars, 74; description of the Abbot's funeral, 75; the Islip Roll, 76; Islip's successor: changed conditions of the Abbey, 78

Benson, Mr. A. C., *Edward Fitz-Gerald*, 479; *Walter Pater*, 480

Books received, Notes on, 251, 495

Bradley, Mr. A. C., *Captain John Smith*, 242

Butler, William Archer, 301 *sqq.*: his birth and upbringing (as a Roman Catholic), 302; he joins the Church of Ireland, 304; enters Trinity College, Dublin: his reputation there, *ib.*; poetical temperament: his

BUT

Remembrances of a Poetical Childhood, 305 ; religion held a foremost place in his heart, 306; his 'Laconics,' 308 ; his poem *The Voice of Friendship*, 310 ; thoughts on the choice of a profession, 311 ; promoted to a professorship in Philosophy : ordained deacon, 312 ; his wholly strenuous life, 313 ; his lectures, the *History of Ancient Philosophy* : appreciation of critics, 314 ; his indefatigable parochial work, 315 ; preferred to the living of Raymochy, 316 ; his sermons : their matter and style, 317 ; eagerly sought for as a preacher : best remembered by his sermons, 318; introduction to Wordsworth, 320 ; defence of Mr. Gladstone in connexion with 'the Pusey heresy,' 322 ; the *Letters on Development*, 323 ; how these were received, 324 ; Butler's own Church principles, 325 ; a speech on Church education, 326 ; the treatment of the famishing multitudes in the famine of 1846, 327 ; Butler's views on faith, 330

CHILDREN, Books about, 391 *sqq.* : the cult of childhood at least coeval with Christianity, 391 ; reasons for the prevalent taste for the nursery and its details, 392 ; Mr. W. H. Hudson's *A Little Boy Lost*, 394 ; why this taste was not satisfied before, 395 ; children in past ages : the Tudor period, *ib.* ; Puritanism : John Wesley's mother's method, 396 ; children's literature in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, 397; Miss Edgeworth's stories, 398 ; Evangelical writers : Mrs. Sherwood's *The Fairchild Family*, 399 *sq.* ; characteristics of her work, 400 ; Mrs. Ewing : an outcome of the Tractarian Revival, 401; her *Six to Sixteen*, *ib.* ; her love for the home, 402 ; *Daddy Darwin's Dovecot*, and *The Story of a Short Life*, *ib.* ; Mr. Kenneth Grahame's *The Golden Age* : the child interpreted from within, 403 ; the author's characteristics, 404 ; Mr. Pater's *Child in the Home*, *ib.* ; childlike spirit of Mr. Stevenson's *A Child's Garden of Verses*, 405 ; Mr. Barrie is the most accurate observer of children : *The Little White Bird*, *ib.* ; the study of a boy's conscience in Mrs. Dearmer's *The Noisy Years*, 406 ; the children in Mrs. Nesbit's *Oswald Bastable* and *The Treasure Seekers*, *ib.* ; a home with good nursery discipline in Mrs. Allen Harker's *The Romance of a Nursery* and *Concerning Paul and Fiammetta*, 407

Church Quarterly Review, The : Past and Present, 1 *sqq.* : chief aim of its original promoters (1875), 1 ; need of the wider dissemination of sound knowledge on religious questions, 2 ; how the *Review* has supplied this need, *ib.* ; its articles on Apologetic literature, *ib.* ; Home Mission work, 3 ; the requirements of Foreign Mission work, *ib.* ; necessity for the increase of the diocesan episcopate, 4 ; Ecclesiastical Courts : the alleged 'disloyalty' of a section of the clergy, 5 ; relations with other Churches, 5 *sq.* ; articles on liturgical and doctrinal studies, 6 ; a comprehensive survey of modern movements in Philosophy, History, Music, Art, Literature and Science, 7 ; the question of anonymity of contributors, 8 ; the numerous distinguished writers who have supplied articles to the *Review*, 8 *sqq.* ; reasons for lowering its price, 10 ; its standard will not be lowered, 11

Clarke, Mr. J. L., *The Eternal Saviour-Judge*, 452

DEA

DEARMER, Mrs., *A Child's Life of Christ*, 230
Denmark, the Church of, 80 *sqq.*: early relations of the Church of England and the Danish Church, 81; King Cnut sends many bishops and priests to Denmark, 83; English monks help towards the creation of Christian culture there, *ib.*; growth of German ascendency in Denmark, 84; Reformation epoch, 85; several resemblances and differences between the English and the Danish Churches: the Articles, 87; likeness of liturgy and ritual, 89; later position of the Episcopate, *ib.*; possibilities of mutual intercourse, 92; literary relation of the Danes with England, 93; recent increasing communication between England and Denmark, 93; Danish religious parties, 96; present Church government: Frederic VII.'s 'Ground Law,' 100; the limits of intercommunion of the two Churches, 104
Dennett, Mr. R. E., *At the Back of the Black Man's Mind*, 460

ECCLESIASTICAL Courts, 13 *sqq.*: the conclusions of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, 13; the charge they had to investigate, 14; the working of the present Ecclesiastical Courts, 15; real cause of the failure of prosecutions for ritual offences, 16; question of appeal from the courts, 17; Henry VIII.'s Statute of the Submission of the Clergy, 18; the Court of Delegates, 19; its functions transferred to the Privy Council, 20; Churchmen's objection to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Privy Council, *ib.*; the Council claims the function of determining the law of the Church, 22; appeal in litigation in Ecclesiastical Courts which involves property, 24; ecclesiastical sentences involving suspension and deprivation: the system which prevails in Scotland, 26; both Commissions (1881, 1906) hold that the existing system of courts as a working system cannot be maintained, 27; their proposals of reform of the Diocesan and Provincial Courts, 28; the final Court of Appeal, *ib.*; appeal to the Crown, 29; the fundamental principles which govern this matter, 30; the control which the High Court of Justice exercises over Ecclesiastical Courts, 32; a final court truly ecclesiastical suggested, 33; the language of the Statute of Appeals and of the Statute of Submission, 34; Mr. Justice Phillimore's opinion, 35; relative positions of the 'High Church' and the 'Low Church' parties, 38; need of making more elastic the existing law of ritual and ceremonial, 39

EUR

Eck, Rev. H. V. S., *Sin*, 445
Elton, Professor O., *Frederick York Powell*, 239
Euripides and his Modern Interpreters, 156 *sqq.*: the recent rehabilitation of Euripides, 157; Browning's translations, *ib.*; former treatment of Euripides in England, 158; appreciation of several of his dramas, 159; recent works on him by Dr. Verrall, Mr. Gilbert Murray, 160; Prof. Paul Decharme, Mr. W. H. S. Jones, 161; object of Dr. Verrall's volumes, *ib.*; the purpose and effect of the poet's plays, 162; modern depreciation of Euripides is partly due to his querulous tone, 163; Dr. Verrall's view that the *Andromache* is a 'second volume,' 164; his treatment of the play commonly called *Helen*, 165; of *Heracles Mainomenos*, 166; the *Orestes*, *ib.*; Mr. Gilbert

Murray's English verse-translations of Euripides, 167

Evolution and Morality, 331 *sqq.*: criticism of Dr. Westermarck's *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, 331; his dictum that 'there are no general moral truths,' 332; on the origin of the moral emotions: 'tribal custom was the earliest rule of duty,' 333; three different opinions expressed by the author, 334; his examples of 'meaningless' statements, 335; his argument proceeds on ambiguity, 336; Mr. Hobhouse's *Morals in Evolution*: the author's view of what is 'good' for each man, *ib.*; of the 'ultimate basis of morals,' 337; what he means by 'the rationality of morals,' 338; the gap between the good of the individual and the good of society, 339; there is a tendency, he thinks, to their harmony, *ib.*; but the philosophical problem is to discover how to harmonize them, 340; the form of development which is best for the individual, 341

GASQUET, Abbot, *Parish Life in Mediaeval England*, 236

Gospel History, The, and its Transmission, 169 *sqq.*: Mr. Burkitt's work on the subject, 169; Dr. Salmon's posthumous work, *The Human Element in the Gospels*, 171; Dr. Abbott's *Silanus the Christian*, Harnack's *Luke the Physician*, 172; evidence that our Four Gospels were accepted as Scripture in the year 150, 174; criticism of Mr. Burkitt's theory that the early Christian Church took very little interest in the historical Christ, 176; the *Didache* clearly presupposes the existence of a Gospel, 177; the speech of St. Peter in Acts x. 36 *sq.*, 178; Mr. Burkitt's parallel arguments in regard to St. Paul's Epistles, 179; the growth of the Canon of the Gospels, 180; the date at which the several Gospels were written, 181; St. Luke and St. Mark, 181 *sqq.*; the origin of the Synoptic Gospels, 184; priority and historical value of St. Mark's narrative, 185; Dr. Salmon's view as to St. Mark being the interpreter of St. Peter, 186; the origin of those portions of St. Matthew and St. Luke which are not contained in St. Mark, 187; Dr. Salmon's theory, 188; the sections of St. Luke's Gospel which are peculiar to it, 189; Dr. Salmon on the story of the Gadarene swine, and on the raising of Lazarus, 190 *sq.*; Mr. Burkitt's views, 192; bearings of these criticisms on the faith of a Christian, 193; the several grounds of their investigations asserted by the writers we have quoted, 194; basis of our belief in the Divine character and Personality of Christ, 195; attitude of the devout Christian with regard to miracles, 197

HALL, Rev. H. E., *A Longer Catechism*, 450

Herrmann, Prof. W., *Communion with God*, 452

Hone, Mr. N. J., *The Manor and Manorial Records*, 473

Hyde, Rev. Dr., *From Epicurus to Christ*, 455

JACKSON, Rev. H. L., *The Fourth Gospel and some recent German Criticism*, 440

LEA, Dr., *History of the Inquisition in Spain*, 468

Leonard, Major, *The Lower Niger and its Tribes*, 462

Lock, Mr. R. H., *Recent Progress in the Study of Variation*, &c., 458

LOD

Lodge, Sir O., *The Substance of Faith allied with Science*, 447

MARKHAM, Sir C., *A Memoir of Archbishop Markham*, 476
Moore, Rev. Dr. K., *The Way to Teach the Bible*, 233
Mortimer, Rev. Dr., *Confession and Absolution*, 451
Moulton, Dr. J. H., *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 441

NEW COLLEGE and King's: a Study in Reform, 39 *sqq.*: the origins of the four foundations, Eton and King's, and New College and Winchester, 41; connexion between the two colleges and the schools which respectively fed them, 42; some bad results of methods of Wykeham and Henry VI., 43; lines of reform, 44; effects of the new statutes (*Ordinances*), 45; the part borne in the reforms by Mr. Augustus Austen Leigh, 46; the functions of a Tutor at Cambridge, *ib.*; solution of similar problems at New College, 47; the changes, 48; question of the restriction of celibacy from holders of Fellowships, 49; how it was solved by both Colleges, 50; matters dealt with by the two University Commissions (1877-79), 51; the value and tenure of Scholarships and Fellowships, 52; Mr. Leigh's efforts to carry out reforms, 54; Mr. A. Robinson's similar labours at New College, 55
New Theology, The (notice of the Rev. R. J. Campbell's book), 409 *sqq.*: the author's irreverent parodies of popular religious thought, 410; his statement of the main purpose of the book, 411; his definition of the meaning of God, *ib.*; a return to the Gnostic difficulty, 'How can

OMA

the Infinite become finite?' 412; the terms 'infinite' and 'finite' only express the limitation of our intellect, 413; God is self-limited, *ib.*; Mr. Campbell's conception of God is not the Christian conception, 414; he implicitly denies the Fatherhood of God, 415; the relation of man to God: 'the ultimate Self of the universe is God,' 416; his claim that his doctrine is not Pantheism but a Monistic idealism, *ib.*; his treatment of sin and evil, 418; what he means by sin, 419; difficulty of grasping his theory of evil, *ib.*; on the 'theological muddle' caused by the Christian doctrine of sin, 420; Mr. Campbell's patronizing eulogy of our Lord, 422; his views on the Divinity of Christ: the 'Divine Man,' the 'eternal Christ,' 423; Mr. Campbell has perverted and exaggerated Christian truth, 424; his treatment of the Atonement, 425; 'there is no theory of the Atonement in the New Testament,' 426; but why and how has the world learnt it? 427; the lesson mankind has learnt from the Cross of Christ, 429; the fundamental error underlying Mr. Campbell's writings, 430; what is his ultimate authority? 431; the Bible has lost the position it held with Protestants, 432; Mr. Campbell's opinion that 'Religion is necessary to mankind but Churches are not,' 433; but it is in the Churches that the Christian ideal is most perfectly realized and most adequately represented, *ib.*; why this new theology fails, 434

OMAN, Prof. C., *The Political History of England*, vol. iv.; *The Great Revolt of 1381*, 465

PAL

PALLADIUS and Egyptian Monasticism, 105 *sqq.*: the literature of early monasticism, 106; objects of the monastic life, 108; consideration of some origins assigned, 108 *sq.*; Paul of Thebes and his disciples, 109; the daily life of the recluses, 110; growth of the standard of austerity, 111; their primary aim was perfection, to be attained by escape from all worldly distractions, 112; manner of life of Chronius and his disciples: how their spiritual needs were provided for, 113; how the prerogatives of 'confessors' worked out, 114; growth of practices of austerity; 116; asceticism in clothing, 117; food, 119; their longevity, 120; their dwellings ('monasteries'), 121; the delusions to which the monks were often subject, 122; the 'wonders' reported by Palladius, 122 *sq.*; belief in the attacks of visible demons, 124; the doctrine of guardian angels, 125; despite their separate lives, the monks had always the consciousness of neighbourhood, *ib.*; Pachomius, the completer of Antony's work: his Rule and its successors, 120

Paul, Mr. H., *A History of Modern England, V.*, 477

Periodicals, 243, 485

Pullan, Mr. Leighton, *The Church of the Fathers*, 465

RELIGIOUS Crisis in France, The, 198 *sqq.*: examination of Canon Henson's condemnation of the Church in France, 199; his inference from the General Elections, 200; comparison of elections in France and in England, 201; political aims of the French voter: he did not believe that religion was attacked, 202; how he was deceived, 203; the opposition to the Inventory-making, 204; characteristics of the manifestations, 205; the schismatic object of *Associations cultuelles*, 206; treatment of leases to curés of confiscated churches, 207; the Prefect's jurisdiction over curés' presbyteries, 208; the machinery of French Freemasonry, 211; the present day Test Act in France: *not* to go to Mass, 213; signs of general dissatisfaction among various classes, 215; real feelings of the agricultural classes, tradesmen and business people, 216; the meaning and power of Freemasonry in France, 217; illustrative examples of its methods of influencing elections, 218; the class of deputy it requires, 219; the people's blind following of the Government, 220; impossibility of unsectarian Christianity in France, 221; religious schools are still well attended, 222; proofs that the hold of the Church on the people of France is firm, 223

Richmond, Rev. W., *The Gospel of the Rejection*, 440

Ritchie, Prof. D. G., *Philosophical Studies*, 456

Roscoe, Sir H. E., The Life and Experiences of, 238

SAI

ST. DAVID and the Early Welsh Saints, 277 *sqq.*: the golden period of the Welsh Church, 277; Romano-Celtic origin of the Cambro-British Church, 278; development of parish churches from monasteries, 279; the principal monasteries, 280; the life of St. Illtyd, Abbot of Llantwit and tutor of St. David, 282; legend of his rescued deer, 283; St. David (or Dewi): story of his birth, 284; his studies under Illtyd at Llantwit and Paulinus at Whitland, 285; the conference (at Brefi) between the orthodox and

the Pelagian clergy, 285; David's address to the assembly and its results, 286; he succeeds Dubricius as primate and arch-abbot (Caerleon), 287; removes the mother-see to Menevia, *ib.*; his rule of his monastery and his own manner of life, 288; the 'Synod of Victory,' 289; the saint's death, *ib.*; his posthumous fame: his title of patron saint of Wales, 290; fame and sanctity of his shrine, 291; account of St. Teilo and the 'Teilo churches,' 292; a relic of the saint still preserved, 293; life and work of Padarn, disciple of St. David, 294; St. Deiniol, first bishop of Bangor, 295; St. Asaph, disciple of the Scottish saint Kentigern, 296; story of St. Winifred, *ib.*; the legend of her well, 297; few female saints in the early Cambro-British Church, 299

Scott, Mr. E. F., *The Fourth Gospel*, its Purpose and Theology, 438

Seccombe, T., and Nicoll, W. R., *The Bookman Illustrated History of English Literature*, 478

Snagge, Lady, *Simple Talks to Little Children on Holy Subjects*, 234

Sweating of Women's Labour, London Home Industries and the, 128 *sqq.*: a typical gathering of London Home Workers, 128; description of the women, their trades, their very small earnings, 129 *sqq.*; various causes which bring so many women into home industries, 136; sub-sweaters and their 'apprentices,' 137; the cases here are fairly representative, 138; mental and physical characteristics produced in the sweated, 139; yet they are good women, moral, honest, sober, 141; causes which lead to the sweating of women, 142; difficulty of fixing the blame, 143; methods of the 'Season' trades, 144; proposals suggested towards lessening the sweating evil, 145; some objections to these, 146; proposed establishment of a *minimum wage*, 148; decent housing is an essential if sweating is to be abolished, 151; the housing scheme of the Home Workers' Aid Association, 154

Swete, Rev. Dr., *The Apocalypse of St. John*, 224

THIRTY Years' War, The (Cambridge Modern History, Vol. IV.), 235

UNIVERSITY of Durham, The Future of the, 257 *sqq.*: earlier foundations, 257; first steps (1831) towards the present foundation: object of the promoters, 258; gradual formation (1832–42) of the regulations for the government of the University, 259; powers vested in the Dean and Chapter, 260; the Commission (1861) 'to provide for the better government of the University': its Ordinances disallowed, 261; regulations made by a Statute of Chapter (1865) *ib.*; expense of students reduced: consequences, 262; the Armstrong College (of Physical Science), Newcastle, affiliated, *ib.*; efforts towards transference of powers of government from the Chapter to the Senate, 263; Bishop Westcott's proposed conference on the subject rejected, 264; ultimate result: the Bill of 1907, 265; the different status of a local and of a national University, 266; how the Bill makes the University completely autonomous, 267; the 'Council of the Durham Colleges,' *ib.*; conditions of admission to degrees, 268;

the re-constitution of the Senate, *ib.*; power of affiliating other colleges, 269; question of study of Latin and Greek, 270; the Church's interests in the University, 271; need of religious freedom, *ib.*; proper independence and autonomy guaranteed by the proposed constitution, 273; the harmonizing of Durham and Newcastle, 274; high standard of Matriculation and of real learning desiderated, 276

WISDOM Literature, The Theology of the, 342 *sqq.*: general point of view of the Wisdom writers, 342; their concern with 'Hokmah' (Wisdom), 343; the 'Humanists' of Israel, *ib.*; they write as students of life, 344; the Wisdom writers' treatment of the Nature and Being of God, 346; their general assumption that God exists, 347; their Divine Being compared with the God of the Prophets, 348; the Divine order in the world, 350; the forces of Nature act in ceaseless obedience to the Divine will, 351; the Divine order in its relation to the moral life of Man, *ib.*; the Psalmists and Jeremiah greatly perplexed by the prosperity of the wicked, 353; how the Book of Job is to be estimated, 354; Eschatology of the Wisdom Literature: death, 355; the idea of Immortality, 356; two passages in Job, 357; the doctrine of the Book of Wisdom, 358; none of the five books is wholly devoid of all suggestion of Immortality, 359; Man in relation to God, 360; the services which the writers rendered: they checked exclusive nationalism, 361; mitigated rigid legalism, 362; contributed a positive element of Philosophy, Criticism and Reflection, 363; prepared the way for Christianity, 364; in the 'Hokmah' school the personified Divine Wisdom bears a resemblance to the 'Word' who was made flesh at the Incarnation, 365; their religious individualism, 366; the foreshadowing, in Job, of the life and Person of the Saviour, 367; the Wisdom of the Hebrews was a veritable Charisma, 368

Wyndham, Right Hon. George, *Ronsard and La Pléiade*, 241

Spottiswoode & Co. Ltd., Printers, New-street Square London